

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
LIBRARY

JUN 28 '61

LINGUA

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF GENERAL LINGUISTICS
REVUE INTERNATIONALE DE LINGUISTIQUE GÉNÉRALE

Editors — Comité de Rédaction:

A. W. DE GROOT

A. J. B. N. REICHLING

E. M. UHLENBECK

VOLUME IX, 4

1960

NORTH-HOLLAND PUBLISHING COMPANY
AMSTERDAM

CONTENTS - SOMMAIRE

Contributions - Articles de fond

Y. MALKIEL, A Tentative Typology of Romance Historical Grammars	page 321
E. M. UHLENBECK, The Study of the so-called Exotic Languages and General Linguistics	407

Reviews - Comptes-rendus

GERARD MOIGNET, Essai sur le mode subjonctif en latin postclassique et en ancien français (Paul Zumthor)	425
LEOPOLD ZATOČIL, Cato a Facetus, Pojednání a Texty. Zu den deutschen Cato- und Facetusbearbeitungen, Untersuchungen und Texte (W. Schwarz)	428
H. FELDMANN, Die geschichtliche Entwicklung der Hörprüfungsmethoden (L. B. W. Jongkees)	429
ROBERTO FERNANDEZ RETAMAR, Idea de la Estilística (J. A. van Praag)	429
JOSÉ ROCA PONS, Estudios sobre perifrasis verbales del español (J. A. van Praag)	430
G. HERZIG, Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Mundart der Auvergne (vergleichen die Darstellung des gegenwärtigen Lautstandes dreier Orte: Vertaizon, Picherande, Bégut-les-Vabres) (P. Zumthor)	431
CH. CAMPROUX, Etude syntaxique des parlers gévaudanais, (P. Zumthor)	433
MANUEL ALVAR, El español hablado en Tenerife (J. A. van Praag)	434
ALONSO ZAMORA VICENTE, Dialectología española (J. A. van Praag)	435
O. DUCHÁČEK, Latin bellus, vieux français bel; Joliment-bellement; La beauté, le beau - la joliesse, le joli (P. Zumthor)	436
HENRY MENDELOFF, The Evolution of the Conditional Sentence Contrary to Fact in Old Spanish (J. A. van Praag)	437
Bolletino dell' Atlante linguistico mediterraneo (P. Zumthor)	447

DAMASCIUS

LECTURES ON THE PHILEBUS WRONGLY ATTRIBUTED TO OLYMPIODORUS TEXT, TRANSLATION, NOTES AND INDICES

by

L. G. WESTERINK

The anonymous commentaries on the Phaedo and the Philebus which were appended to the collected commentaries of Olympiodorus about 900, have long been an unknown quantity in Neoplatonic studies. Though they are commonly referred to as the work of Olympiodorus, they are evidently far superior to the standard that prevailed at Alexandria in the sixth century. Recent research has pointed towards Damascius as their main source.

6 x 9" xxii + 149 pages f 22,50 (45 s., \$ 6.30)

Ask your Bookseller or the Publishers

**NORTH-HOLLAND PUBLISHING COMPANY
AMSTERDAM**

A TENTATIVE TYPOLOGY OF ROMANCE HISTORICAL GRAMMARS.*

This paper has been written with full knowledge of the relative eclipse, throughout the last decades, of historical grammar as a genre of scholarly inquiry. The author has also been keenly aware of the modest rôle played by Romance scholarship – so brilliantly represented in etymology, dialect geography, and stylistics – along this particular line, even at the height of the neogrammatical vogue, which truly marked the Golden Age of the genre.

The justification for the present experiment, despite these implied disclaimers, is dual. First, it represents a pilot study, another link in a so far very short chain of exploratory typological surveys and, if found worthy of attention, may at some future date lead to a more ambitious typology of diachronic grammars, cutting through all known language families (references to non-Romance languages have been here kept to the barest minimum). Clearly, a start had to be made somewhere, and every worker, I suppose, enjoys the privilege of conducting the initial, most hazardous experiments on his home-ground. Second, the project is based on the broad assumptions that the pendulum of taste and preference in linguistics may soon start swinging back toward dynamics; that in this connection a vigorous revival of diachronic grammar is a strong and pleasant possibility; that, to be effectively resuscitated, the genre must undergo a radical change; that a typological survey of distinctive features in the older output may very well alert us not only to past accomplishments, but to fruitful approaches thus far overlooked; and that in the rejuvenation of historicism Romance scholarship, by virtue of its unrivaled resources, may yet be called upon to play a leading part.

The typological classification of scholarly writings has been defined elsewhere ¹⁾. Whereas even the most sophisticated bibliography in-

* For a summary see p. 416.

¹⁾ See my earlier articles "The uniqueness and complexity of etymological solutions", *Lingua*, V:3 (1956), 225–252; "A tentative typology of etymological studies", *IJAL*, XXIII (1957), 1–17; "Distinctive features in lexicography: a typological approach to dictionaries exemplified with Spanish", *RPh.*, XII (1958–59), 366–399, and XIII (1959–60), 111–155, a condensed and revised

evitably treats each item as an indivisible unit, typology – taking its cue from Sapir's flexible classification of languages and from the separation of a speech sound into a number of distinctive features – operates on the theory that a monograph or a handbook is analyzable as a bundle of characteristic traits that can be reassembled, as it were, in miscellaneous arrangements. Undoubtedly, such arrangements can, if necessary, be expressed in a simple formula. The present article stops short of providing actual formulas (useful, at best, as a reference tool), but leads the reader to the point from which such succinct labeling can be freely envisaged. The reason for this restraint is that the theoretical discussion of the fission of grammar into constituent elements seems far more rewarding in its implications than do any immediately anticipated practical results.

PRELIMINARIES

0.0. Definition. A historical grammar may be defined as a formal arrangement of strictly linguistic data pertaining to structure rather than to the lexicon and viewed in diachronic perspective; that is to say, it presupposes at least two parallel sets of forms separated by a sufficiently extended period of time for sharply marked contrasts between corresponding forms to have crystallized, if not in every instance, at least on a considerable scale. A running commentary on a linguistically noteworthy text, even if it is as weighty as E. Löfstedt's classic annotations to the *Peregrinatio Aetherae* (1911), is no substitute for a historical grammar because of its inherent looseness and selectivity; nor would any essentially historical account spiced with stray linguistic illustrations provide an acceptable replacement.

0.1. Minimum scope. Historical grammars further presuppose quantitatively adequate coverage. A narrowly delimited monograph, however valuable as a piece of spadework or as the testing of a method, represents, at best, a potential contribution to historical grammar, but no full-blown specimen. Neither do loose groups of

version of which was offered at the Indiana University Conference on Lexicography in November, 1960, under the title "A typological classification of dictionaries on the basis of distinctive features"; and an unpublished lecture, delivered in November, 1959, at the Universities of Oxford, Leiden, and Copenhagen: "Distinctive features of Romance linguistics".

related studies in, say, phonology, such as Cuervo's trail-blazing *Disquisiciones* (1895) or its modern counterpart, A. Alonso's inquiries into the pronunciation of pre-Classical and Golden Age Spanish (1955-), constitute samples of a well-organized historical grammar; still less so a miscellany of previously published articles, a venture frequently planned by well-wishers as a tribute to an eminent scholar, even if each item included bears on diachronic linguistics.

0.2. "Comparative" versus "historical". Every historical grammar is, by definition, comparative, the minimum comparison residing, we recall, in a point-by-point confrontation of two successive, reasonably distant stages of the same language. (Conventionally, one speaks of "comparative historical grammar" only where more than one daughter-language is contrasted with the actual or putative ancestral tongue.) On the other hand, the reverse may not be true: a comparative grammar need not be historical, since two autonomous systems, whether or not cognate, may be legitimately opposed in terms of architectural design, without any concern for genetics; witness Bally's austere synchronic dismounting, on a grandiose scale, of the mechanisms of contemporary German and French (1932).

0.3. Prototypes. It is customary to label historical grammar as, fundamentally, a genre of 19th- and early-20th-century scholarship. For practical purposes, this rather short-sighted chronological attribution is defensible. Yet certain prototypes of the modern genre, traceable, in extreme cases, as far back as pre-Humanism, are not wholly unworthy of the present-day analyst's attention, not only because they may significantly anticipate later developments, but, more important, because, upon occasion, their peculiar slants, reflecting an untutored attitude on the part of pioneers, may naïvely exploit certain worth-while possibilities later neglected or even deliberately ignored.

SCOPE

1.0. Definition and subdivision. Under scope one advantageously subsumes not the number of linguistic disciplines (morphology, syntax, etc.) brought into play, but the breadth and depth of the material chosen for analysis and the general evolutionary perspective in which the observer elects to examine it.

We shall designate as *breadth* the number of families, languages, or dialects subjected, as independent entities, to systematic comparison. *Depth* will signal the length of time selected along the chronological axis, both in absolute terms and with special attention to the number of clearly discernible stages with which the analyst decides to operate. The *direction* is twofold: either prospective, when the starting point is the older of two, or the oldest of several, consecutive phases compared; or retrospective, if the reverse view is favored, as when the examination of a modern Romance language is punctuated with flashbacks to the Latin or medieval antecedents, or the entire distance is covered in converse direction.

1.1. Breadth. It is not unnatural that, as new languages come to light, through archeological excavations and anthropological canvassing, the breadth of coverage should tend to expand. This is true even of the Romance domain, where, on the whole, discoveries have lately been unsensational. Of the two classic treatments of Romance grammar as a unified field, Diez's pioneer work (1836-44) operated rather consistently with six languages: Portuguese, Spanish, French, Provençal, Italian, and "Valachian", i.e., Rumanian; his comparative dictionary, launched at a later date, afforded, in addition, occasional glimpses of "Churwelsch" (in modern taxonomy, Western Raeto-Romance). Meyer-Lübke's monumental comparative grammar – and, in its wake, Guarnerio's pan-Romanic phonology – shows a lesser degree of consistency, the number of languages and dialects contrasted depending entirely on the diversification achieved by each single feature (the typical range of possibilities varies from five to ten). ²⁾

²⁾ Thus, to limit ourselves to those tabulations with which his *Lautlehre* is dotted, Meyer-Lübke sliced the sum total of the Romance progeny of a given Latin vowel, diphthong, or consonant (each confined to one peculiar position) into a varying number of units: five for stressed *a* (§223: Rum. Friul. It. Prov. Sp.), for the early syncope of the posttonic vowel (§325: Rum. Eng. Tusc. Fr. Sp.) and for pretonic *au* (§354: same constellation); seven for stressed *au* (§282: Rum. Eng. Tusc. Prov. Fr. Sp. Ptg.); eight for pretonic *ē, ě* (§352: Rum. Friul. Surs. Tusc. Mil. Fr. Sp. Cat.); nine for stressed *ō* (§183: Rum. Friul. Eng. Tusc. Mil. Prov. OFr. Sp. Ptg.) and for the late syncope of the posttonic vowel (§332: Rum. Eng. Friul. Tusc. Emil. Mil. Fr. Prov. Sp.); ten for *kei* (§403: Log. Vegl. Alb. It. Rum. Eng. Ven. Gen. Fr. Sp.). Guarnerio's *Fonologia* offers a scope similarly varying from case to case: §157 (eight), §180 (five), §198 (eleven), §212 and 224 (eight).

In his methodological primer – not, strictly speaking, a historical grammar – the same author allowed initially (1901) for eight languages (all subject to further subdivision), including Sardinian but omitting Catalan; to these, on second and third thought (1909, 1920), he added Dalmatian for good measure. Understandably, elementary treatments catering to the needs of beginners and of captive audiences may arbitrarily reduce the number of languages examined; thus, Zauner, in his contribution to the Göschen series, and Bourciez, in his *Éléments*, down to the latest revisions of both books, have each been satisfied with analyzing seven languages, including Raeto-Romance, but dispensing with Catalan, Sardinian, and Dalmatian. At present, the well-informed grammarian, even if his book is small-sized (as is true of Lausberg's), takes into account all ten sharply profiled languages. Though a good deal of advanced research has been carried out on the fragmentarily preserved Latinity of the upper and central Danube basin (the Roman provinces of Noricum and Pannonia) as well as of Northwest Africa, and though reports on current investigations, such as Kuhn's (1952), do make it a point to digest and to appraise these findings, a formal Romance grammar so organized as to do justice, at every level, to all twelve Romance languages, living and extinct, is neither presently available nor expected in the foreseeable future.

Within a comparative arrangement, one language may be assigned a position of such preponderance as to make it outweigh any other in isolation, and, in extreme cases, all others taken jointly. Diez's pioneering dictionary (1854) reserved a favorite treatment for Italian. Among the grammarians, Darmesteter showed a measure of discrimination in his early treatise of Romance composition (1876), probing into French more than into all its cognates combined.³⁾ On a smaller

Abbreviations used in this paper which may not be self-explanatory include Alb.: Albanian, Emil.: Emiliano (between North and Central Italian), Friul.: Friulano (Eastern Raeto-Romance), Gen.: Genoese (medieval and modern Ligurian), Log.: Logudorese (northcentral Sardinian), Mil.: Milanese (central Lombard), Surs.: Surselvan or Obwaldisch (western branch of Western Raeto-Romance), Tusc.: Florentine Tuscan (underlying standard Italian), Vegl.: Vegliotic (last residue of Northern Dalmatian), Ven.: Venetian (language of Venice and/or the Veneto).

³⁾ This disproportion shows clearly in the exhaustive three-column index of quoted forms (pp. 257–316): French compounds occupy roughly two thirds of the space (pp. 257–296), even after the subtraction of proper names, while the

scale, Bourciez in his *Éléments* evinced the same bias, earmarking Old French and Modern French for separate treatment, while allowing congener languages to come up, at best, for a single discussion. This trend may lead to a "comparative" grammar, however paradoxical, of ostensibly a single language, as undertaken by Meillet for Armenian (1903) and by Sturtevant for Hittite (1933).

Two matters of signal importance, particularly for the expert in linguistic classification, are (a) the order in which the members of a group are arrayed (note, in Meyer-Lübke's scheme as of 1909, the shift of Sardinian from the final position to the point midway between Italian and Provençal) and (b) the joint treatment of certain pairs and triads, implying the existence of subgroups within the family (as when Bourciez, bent on economy and concentration, subjoined Provençal to French and Portuguese to Spanish).

Systematic comparison of just two or three out of several cognate languages has been far less assiduously practised in Romance than in Indo-Europeanist quarters, conceivably because there has been less stimulus or excuse for engaging in it. Thus, the age-old two-pronged study of classical philology created a background against which there arose a demand for comparative grammars of classical Greek and Latin – a demand which specialists of the stature of Buck and the Meillet-Vendryes team readily filled on either side of the Atlantic. No comparable large-scale ventures come to mind where the Romance offshoots of Latin are concerned, not even one of such obvious usefulness as might be the systematic confrontation of Spanish and Portuguese projected against their common source.⁴⁾ Among respectable minor projects of this kind, easily the best-known are Suchier's joint treatment of French and Provençal, echoed by Gamillscheg in 1921,

space allotted to Provençal, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Rumanian, Ladin (i.e., Raeto-Romance), and "Vaudois" (pp. 310–313) is equal to the space reserved for classical Greek (pp. 307–310), a pathetic premonition of the French educational system grouping the national language with Latin and Greek to the lasting detriment of Romance comparatism.

⁴⁾ One may disregard in this context Pe Martín Sarmiento's pioneer work on Galician vs. Castilian viewed in comparison to Latin and, on still better grounds, the sporadic attempts of certain patriotic Renaissance *dilettanti* to demonstrate that one Romance language, by virtue of its greater proximity to Latin, hence its superior "purity", carried more literary prestige than its closest rival; see E. Buceta.

and Meyer-Lübke's somewhat biased (hence, controversial) analysis of Catalan against the dual backdrop of Provençal and Castilian – inexplicably, to the near-exclusion of Aragonese. Add Delattre's ingenious, if modest, attempt to demonstrate that characteristic sound developments peculiar to fairly recent layers of Spanish closely parallel those plausibly reconstructed for the early history of French. As a slightly anachronistic curiosity note further Deferrari's separate treatment, between two covers, of three related historical phonologies – those of French, Spanish, and Italian –, an experiment involving a measure of tacit, unintegrated comparison. This repetitious blueprint is inferior to the encyclopedia-like arrangement of grammatical sketches of cognate languages drawn by a skillfully coördinated group of specialists, with cross-linguistic methodological surveys underpinning the separate sections, as planned in Gröber's *Grundriß*; for strings of sketches executed by a single expert, cf. Monteverdi's *Avviamento* and Tagliavini's *Origini*.

Ordinarily, the diachronic dissection of a single fully documented language is deemed of sufficient latitude to justify a self-contained historical grammar. Thus, to name at random a few middle-sized samples of this genre, scholars and especially students have at their disposal manuals so organized for Rumanian (Tiktin), Raeto-Romance (Gartner), Old Provençal (Schultz-Gora), Catalan (Moll), Spanish (Hanssen), and Portuguese (Nunes). In further subdividing this abundant output, one must determine whether the literary language occupies the focus of attention (except for the medieval period where, for transparent reasons, dialectal cleavage cannot be entirely ignored) or whether the author also takes into account regional speech, down to its present stage, frequently characterized by inner disintegration and loss of social prestige. An example of the former slant is Brunot's handbook, even after its thorough revision by Bruneau. The latter preference is best exemplified by Meyer-Lübke's original Italian grammar (not necessarily by its adaptations), also, more explicitly and on a grandiose scale, by Rohlfs's mid-20th-century counterpart. In Ronjat's lifework, the polyphony of the Occitanian dialects practically drowns out the thin voice of Provençal literature. In the case of marginal cultures lacking a universally recognized literary standard, a generous measure of dialectological coloring is unavoidable in any unilingual historical grammar; witness Wagner's many-faceted ap-

proach to Sardinian and Gartner's equal concern with all ramifications of Raeto-Romance. Inevitably, the typologist discovers multifarious transitions and compromises; thus, all Old French grammars of necessity dwell on dialectal peculiarities, but Schwan-Behrens's alone is advantageously known for its deliberate concentration on this feature, an interest marked by its geographically even spread; in contrast, Pope, without failing to do justice to the whole, designedly selects for preferential treatment a single dialect of favored cultural implications, Anglo-Norman.

Further narrowing the latitude, one arrives at those historical grammars which deal with dialects and dialect groups, that is, with mere fractions of a unilingual domain. The border-line between "language" and "dialect group" remains, of course, quite imprecise; an imaginative scholar, starting out with a modest, well-conducted dialect study, may be ultimately led to posit, on the strength of his own unanticipated findings, the existence of an independent language. Conceivably this, or some similar, experience underlies Ascoli's inquiries into Raeto-Romance and Franco-Provençal, both representing milestones in the annals of our discipline, though only the former has led to the indisputable establishment of an autonomous Romance language. Examples of less sensational, but equally solid historical grammars of major dialect groups include Staaff's analysis of medieval Leonese, on the basis of neatly dated and localized archival material (but note Menéndez Pidal's friendly strictures), and Kuhn's synoptic picture of modern Upper Aragonese, resting on a foundation of independent fieldwork, while Rohlf's monograph on Gascon presupposes an unusual degree of familiarity with Gilliéron's earlier linguistic atlas. Historically slanted dialect grammars, whether full-grown or sketchy, did not develop simultaneously for the various territories concerned: one finds them, as expected, at a relatively early date in Italy, amid an intellectual climate dominated by historicism and even antiquarianism at its liveliest (to say nothing of impressively widespread practical command of Latin), while Spain, as usual, has been lagging by a discernible margin: The earliest outlines, incidentally, were here prepared either by foreigners (Munthe, Leite de Vasconcelos) or by natives temporarily immersed in a foreign academic atmosphere (Múgica). The two manuals of peninsular Spanish dialectology presently available (García de Diego, Zamora Vicente) both embody rough sketches of historical grammar.

The logical minimum scope for a historical dialect grammar would be the speech of a single rural community, cf. Sánchez Sevilla's unsurpassed dissertation on the Eastern Leonese subdialect of Céspedes de Tormes. A fitting philological counterpart, namely a full-fledged historical grammar attached to a single text – i.e., in the last analysis, to a single idiolect or, at best, to the idiolects, frequently at variance, of author and copyist(s) – forms part of Menéndez Pidal's masterly *Cid* edition.

Generally speaking, the narrower the geographic spread, the greater the risk of a misapprehension, on the worker's part, of the true re-shaping power of diffusion. Another controversial issue among the minority of historically oriented dialectologists has been the extent and authenticity of regional coloring detectable in the oldest texts. As Remacle and, after him, Gossen and others have amply demonstrated, an ancient provincial "scripta" is far from representing a faithful, unretouched record of local speech.

In discussing breadth, we have so far taken for granted that only languages conjoined by genetic kinship can be fruitfully discussed in a single context. This requires a qualifying correction: Territorial ties may act as a substitute for, or as an adjunct to, family relationship. In Romance the prime example was set by Gröber (1888), whose *Grundriß* gave equal attention to the Romance languages descended from Latin and to such prehistoric tongues (Iberian, Celtic, etc.) as were spoken in areas later converted to Romance culture. From here the path leads, outside the periphery of formal historical grammar, to K. Sandfeld's strictly regional concept of "Balkan linguistics" and to those surveys of linguistic conditions in the Iberian peninsula which have placed a premium on treating Basque on a par with the three local Romance languages (Entwistle, Šišmarëv, Kuen).

1.2. Depth. More difficult to measure (among other reasons, because it is seldom expressly stated in titles and subtitles⁵) is the

⁵) An exception is the clear-cut syntactic pattern "From ... to", unequivocally marking off the starting and the finishing point. It has had a small vogue on both sides of the Atlantic, but only in English-speaking countries (cf. Grandgent, Pope, and Williams). Conceivably a faint echo of this fashion is perceptible in the title of A. Alonso's posthumous work *De la pronunciación medieval a la moderna en español*, on which he worked at Harvard. Cf. also our concluding footnote and the Voretzsch-Rohlf's entry in the appended Bibliography.

dimension of time depth. At this point one must rigorously distinguish between two problems: first, the total span involved; second and more intricate, the temporal subdivision within the inner structure of the book.

In the Romance field the typical historical grammar embraces the millennium and a half that separates a more or less unified Late Latin from the present stage of the given vernacular. A glaring exception to this tradition has been Provençal; since, at the formative stage of Romance scholarship, Old Provençal alone was in the focus of enthusiastic attention, a Provençal historical grammar ordinarily concerns itself exclusively with the development from Latin to, say, the early 13th century (cf. Adams, Appel, Crescini, Grandgent, Schultz-Gora). Because of a certain parallelism, in academic offerings, requirements, and expectations, between the ancient languages and literatures of Northern and Southern France and, secondarily, as a result of the deep gap separating medieval from modern French, there has also arisen a sporadic need for special grammars of Old French (Schwan's, later revised by Behrens, Luquiens's, L. Jordan's, Rheinfelder's, and many others). These must be carefully distinguished from those aiming to span the entire trajectory of French (Brachet, Nyrop, Meyer-Lübke, Pope, Alessio, Regula).

With regard to the other Romance languages, each less sharply differentiated along the chronological axis, the tradition of breaking off the account at the conclusion of the medieval stage has been confined to German and Austrian centers of learning. Contrast, in this respect, Zauner's Old Spanish grammar with those of Spanish – free from chronological shackles – prepared by natives (Menéndez Pidal, García de Diego) and foreigners (Förster, Baist, Hanssen, Pellegrini) alike; Huber's grammar of Old Portuguese with Reinhardstoettner's, D'Ovidio's, Leite's, Michaëlis's, and Williams's broader-gauged ventures; Wiese's grammar of Old Italian with Meyer-Lübke's, Grandgent's, Pei's, and Rohlf's unqualified concern with Italian at all its evolutionary stages.

It is unusual for time depth to measure less than two or three centuries; the torso of A. Alonso's *magnum opus* (see fn. 5, above), though not strictly a specimen of historical grammar, would come close to this specification for a minimum span. Where the focus is on the speech conditions of a single century, even one linguistically as different at its

inception from what it became toward its end as was the 16th century in France and Spain, the chances are that the internal treatment will become basically descriptive and synchronic, enlivened by, at best, flashes of evolutionary thought, though there may remain an ever-present tacit contrast to the usage of the modern period, familiar to readers either from introspection or from elementary training (Darmesteter and Hatzfeld, Gougenheim; Keniston). Also, where the late medieval stage is examined for its own sake, as it were, without constant reference to the parent language (cf. L. Foulet's introductory syntax of Old French), the author will almost unavoidably tend to indulge in a static approach and thus arrive at a flattened projection of near-contemporary facts. Conversely, the study of a single text, if it is accompanied by a grammar cast in bold relief, with each form shown echoing its distant prototype (as is true of the opening volume of Menéndez Pidal's *Cid* edition), may allow the element of dynamics to come to the fore.

The choice of a pattern of internal periodization is one of the crucially important decisions the author of a historical grammar has to take. While the writer of a "language history" (as defined in Section 6.2, below) ordinarily receives his ideas on temporal segmentation from the straight historian or from the student of literature (cf. F. Brunot's monumental venture), unless he selects some such arbitrary unit as a century, the grammarian must rely on unadulterated linguistic data and remains answerable for his proposals only to fellow linguists. The segmentation may be very crude, as in the original blueprint of Keniston's unfinished *Syntax of Castilian prose*⁶); it may be subtle and apply to a single slice of the total material, as when Meyer-Lübke, in his diachronic analysis of Old French vowels (*Hist. frz. Grammatik*, I, §§46–47, 82), distinguished between a preliterate period favoring diphthongization, and an early literary period tending just as strongly

⁶) The jacket of the volume subtitled *The sixteenth century* identifies it as the second of a series of four. The others were to deal with the Middle Ages (1200–1500), the Modern Period (1600–1900), and the Contemporary Period (1900–). A distinctly more cogent division would have set off the scattered pre-Alfonsine writings (–1250) from the crest of the Old Spanish output (1250–1400); a new period of transition (1400–1525) was followed by another epoch of consolidation ("The Golden Age", 1525–1675). The most suitable dividing point for the modern period has not yet been determined, though, so far as the literary idiom is concerned, it may well be placed around 1825 (advent of Romanticism).

toward monophthongization. A similarly sharp reversal of the dominant trend, coincident with a cultural event such as the rise of vernacular literature, need not recur in the evolution of consonants, suffixes, or clauses. The morphological section of Schwan-Behrens's grammar places, on the Vulgar Latin pedestal, a first Old French period, extending to 1100, and tops it with a second Old French period. There remains a lingering doubt: Is this division merely a matter of didactic expediency or does it correspond to an actual cleavage in the stratification?

The pattern of periodization adopted frequently reveals some of the author's basic assumptions. If he prefers to segregate, with Bourciez (*Éléments*), a "common Romance" or "Vulgar Latin" period, in which he jointly examines the prehistory of most shifts traceable to the individual vernaculars, the underlying supposition is that this period (stretching from, say, 300 to 800 A.D.) was one of relative territorial uniformity of usage. By the same token, the chief features of differentiation are tacitly or overtly attributed to later periods. A scholar espousing the opposite viewpoint, i.e., inclining to operate with the hypothesis of early provincial coloring of Latin speech, cannot with a clear conscience adopt this schema, at least not in comparative research.

1.3. Direction. Inherent in the evolutionary approach to history is the placing of the earlier ahead of the later stage, the obvious premise being that certain peculiarities of Phase A, often in conjunction with some supervenient factor, best explain the specific configuration of Phase B. In all likelihood, ninety-nine out of a hundred historical grammars chosen at random abide by this self-evident rule, so that it would be otiose to cite examples.

Nevertheless, one can ferret out a few exceptions. In the early years of this century, Meyer-Lübke urged contributors to a series of historically slanted textbooks (Winter's "Elementarbücher"), published under his supervision, to experiment, if only for pedagogical reasons, with the reverse perspective. At least two members of his team complied with this request: as a result, the original editions of B. Wiese's introduction to Old Italian (1904) and of A. Zauner's introduction to Old Spanish (1908) actually took as their point of departure the medieval phase – which in those instances represented the terminal limit – and led the inexperienced reader back to the assumed starting point. ⁷⁾

⁷⁾ The following passage from B. Wiese's original Preface (1904) to his *Alt-*

Not improbably, this was a widely accepted academic classroom practice in Central Europe, here for once consecrated in formal presentation. The experiment must have soon been written off as a failure, since, in the initiator's lifetime, revised editions of these manuals, traceable to the 'twenties, reverted to the traditional sequence at the cost of a completely recast phonology, while later additions to the series, such as J. Huber's volume on Old Portuguese (1933), from the start adhered to the conventional pattern. It is, of course, theoretically conceivable to take two steps backward, by leading the reader, e.g., first from Modern to Old Italian, then from the latter to the parent language.

In adjoining provinces of linguistic endeavor (e.g., in such avowedly propaedeutic treatises as Voretzsch's introduction to Old French, Krüger's to Modern Spanish, and Gartner's to Rumanian), it was quite natural for the textbook writer to offer his student-readers a few specimens of the material they were most eager to assimilate, and to downgrade such ingredients of historical grammar as were at all deemed worthy of inclusion at the outset to incidental remarks, parenthetic statements, or, at best, intermittent flashbacks of slightly greater length. Significantly, these and similar books were expressly planned as emergency substitutes for classroom instruction at the university level.

A partial compromise between the two directions is not impossible, though in practice it is customary – and advisable – to subordinate the one to the other. Thus, in 1908 Zauner devoted two long chapters to the projection of Old Spanish sounds onto the plane of Latin (pp. 13–56), then, in lieu of an ordinary summary, offered a brief formulaic counterview (pp. 56–64).

COMPREHENSIVENESS

2.0. Definition and subdivision. If "scope" was used as a yardstick

italienisches Elementarbuch seems very quotable: "Einerseits war dafür der Wunsch des Herausgebers dieser Sammlung, ... Meyer-Lübke, maßgebend, andererseits die pädagogische Erwägung, daß der Lernende, welcher die Texte liest, namentlich wenn er allein arbeitet, schneller vom Gewordenen zur Quelle emporsteigt, als von dieser, die er oft erst mühevoll suchen müßte, zu jenem hinab".

for measuring the number of languages involved and the distance between the linguistic stages compared as well as for determining their sequence, "comprehensiveness" here refers to the number of isolable disciplines included in a given piece of diachronic analysis. We shall designate as "unidisciplinary" a grammar concerned with, say, phonology or inflection alone; its "multidisciplinary" counterpart may comprise up to five separate dissections. In Romance scholarship, the traditional succession of core disciplines, which claim our immediate attention, is this: phonology, inflection, word formation, and syntax. A very few extra-comprehensive books extend beyond this conventional limit, including in their purview such peripheral disciplines as semantics and poetics (or at least prosody). Occasional departures from the standard sequence are invariably noteworthy and will elicit some comments at a later juncture; what matters here primarily is the total width of the framework, not yet the pattern of distribution of pegs and notches.

Through a curious coincidence, some disciplines seem each to fall quite naturally into two roughly even parts; thus, phonology is concerned with vowels and consonants; inflection, with declension and conjugation; word formation, with derivation and composition; syntax, with the comportment of words viewed in their immediate context (phrases) and with the configuration of clauses and sentences. Whether this binary division, seductive at first sight, is in the long view defensible, even if one limits it to Romance, is a delicate question; the typologist will probably class studies centering about such "half-disciplines" (e.g., Schuchardt's inquiry into Vulgar Latin vowels or Lombard's researches in Rumanian conjugation) as occupying the mid-point between an authentic grammatical cross-section and a generously carved-out monograph. Investigations still narrower in scope will figure in this survey as straight monographs, capable of ceaselessly nourishing historical grammar and, conversely, at all times fed by it, but, for all this measure of affinity, constituting a separate genre.

The lexicon lies outside the legitimate jurisdiction of historical grammar, though the establishment of a workable liaison between these two poles has been for over a century an ever-present problem of first magnitude (see Section 6.6, below). It does happen, however, that for reasons of expediency publishers offer prospective buyers all

kinds of "package-deals": combinations of historical grammar (or, at least, a sketch or prospectus of its nuclear disciplines) and a dictionary, a reader (anthology, chrestomathy), and the like. The result is either a hybrid book, in which the various ingredients appear amalgamated, or, less offensive, some kind of omnibus volume, in which they are distinguishable, despite the place that they share between two covers. The separation is more pronounced if the heterogeneous sections have been contributed by different authors.

2.1. Unidisciplinary grammars: the core disciplines. Where limitation to a single discipline prevails, phonology traditionally leads by a wide margin, for two quite dissimilar reasons. First, ever since the elevation of sound correspondences to the rank of "laws", under the régime of neo-grammarians, phonology has – rightly or wrongly – enjoyed the reputation of being the most rigorously organized, "scientifically" slanted discipline, allowing clear-cut distinctions and inviting a modest measure of prediction. Esteemed by many experts and most outsiders as the explorer's most reliable guide in the classification of languages and dialects and in the dating and localization of texts, and dreaded by chance acquaintances (such as the average modern-language student) as the most formidable, obtrusively technical approach to language, it has been recognized in university curricula the world over as the safest means of providing an irreducible minimum of linguistic training – a situation which has led to a steady demand for, and correspondingly lively flow of, textbooks of varying degrees of excellence and sophistication. The second and more trivial reason for the margin, in terms of representation, of phonology over its sister disciplines is its normal position as a first link in a chain: Not a few initially ambitious authors, after publishing a sketch or treatise on phonology as the opening volume, fascicle, or installment of a major undertaking, became so discouraged by the lack of response or the shrinkage of financial resources as to abandon or curtail their original plans. In this event, the phonological tract amounts not to a carefully thought-out terminal project, but, pathetically, to a mere torso – and a grim reminder of human frailty. ⁸⁾

⁸⁾ There would be some danger of skirting the domain of the anecdotal in any attempt to discuss here projects left – or seemingly left – unfinished. Aside from the "torso" of Keniston's Spanish syntax and of Múgica's grammar of Old Spanish, one is reminded of Lerch's French syntax, the concluding volume of

Although the latest theoretical thinking recognizes morphology as the very kernel of linguistic analysis, books and articles devoted exclusively to a diachronic view of inflection and word formation have been fairly infrequent, at least, in the Romance domain. One possible contributing factor to this imbalance: Phonology, quite properly, ranks as a key opening up morphology, so that a discussion of the latter in isolation reminds one of the possession of a hopelessly locked treasure-chest. There has, of course, been no dearth of monographic inquiries into minor points (in particular, those of conjugation and derivation), possibly on account of the somewhat greater isolability of, say, a well-defined suffix than of a speech sound. A border-line case, involving a commendable practice, calls for the writing of a separate handbook of morphology based squarely on an earlier treatise on phonology – by the same or, still better, by a different author: Examples in point are the twin volumes of the Latinists Niedermann and Ernout, each a semi-independent piece of masterly, if conservative, research.

The climate of syntactic inquiry is so strongly at variance with those that prevail in the two preceding domains (starting with the techniques used in collecting evidence) that it is not unusual for an imaginative linguist to become specialized as a “syntactician” and to aim at a synthesis of his findings in this field alone.

Random illustrations of unidisciplinary treatises:

(a) Phonology: Guarnerio (pan-Romanic), Múgica (Spanish; also Ford in the Introduction to his *Readings*), Sanchis Guarner (West Catalan), Appel – if one separates his *Abriß* (1918) from the underlying older chrestomathy (Old Provençal);

which (announced in III, xi) never appeared. Shall we live to see Vol. II of Rhein-felder's Old French grammar, which is to complement his phonology, carefully marked as Vol. I (1937; 2d ed., 1953–55)? As regards the chronological limits of works geared to periodization, Densusianu's history of Rumanian was meant to transcend the 16th century. Of some important undertakings only small fragments have so far become accessible. Thus, an aged Meyer-Lübke's ebbing energy fell short of revising his Romance phonology (1890) except for a few chapters of special appeal, published in the 'thirties as separate articles. Of Menéndez Pidal's monumental *Historia de la lengua española*, for which the *Orígenes* was to serve as an opening wedge, only a few short sections, mainly concerned with the substratum, have become available in print as independent publications.

(b) Inflection ⁹): Keller (Spanish) and Šišmarëv (French); studies concerned with the verb alone, such as Fouché's (French), have here been barred from consideration;

(c) Word formation: Adams (Provençal), Alemany Bolufer (Spanish);

(d) Syntax: Haas, Foulet, Lerch, and Gamillscheg (French).

In one important respect, syntactic treatises of the older school differed from researches bearing on phonology and morphology: Their orientation was intermittently rather than consistently diachronic, since the historical analysis was again and again diluted and distorted by "panchronic" logical or, worse, "ethnocentric" psychological considerations. Thus, Haas (1916) conscientiously followed the trajectory of each French construction from the peak of the Middle Ages to the threshold of our own century; to that extent his outlook was historical. But, inexplicably, he set up the incipient stage of Old French as some kind of (unacknowledged) *creatio ex nihilo*: The earliest known constructions issued forth – one gathers from his introductory remarks to each chapter – from certain general, immutable conditions of the human mind, rather than from the unique configuration of colloquial Late Latin syntax, itself the product of neatly identifiable, non-recurrent forces.

2.2. Border-line disciplines. Of the disciplines marginal to historical grammar we seldom possess separate accounts qualifying for unconditional consideration in this context. Thus, even if one agrees with Bally that stylistics is convertible into an integral part of linguistic inquiry, his own pioneering *Traité de stylistique française* is deliberately

⁹) A point of terminology: Though, from the start, morphology (G. "Formenlehre") was understood to include derivation and composition (cf. Munthe, Tiktin [1905], Nunes [1919], Sánchez Sevilla, Densusianu, Rohlf's [1935], and many others, in the wake of Diez and Meyer-Lübke), numerous authors have used it as coterminous with "inflection" (G. "Beugung, Flexionslehre"). This applies equally to separate books and to chapter or section headings in countless manuals, e.g., Gartner's (1883), Pope's, and Williams's. J. Wiggers (1884) examined word formation in a supplement to his morphology of Spanish. Ronjat conjoined the two disciplines without merging them. The norm has been to assign them separate chapters of equal rank, with little unanimity as to the headings: While García de Diego (1914) opposed "morfología" (i.e., inflection) to "temática o lexicogenesia" (i.e., derivation and composition), Pellegrini (1950) contrasted "morfología" with "composizione", the latter, inexplicably, including suffixal derivation.

synchronic, and none of his closer followers has bothered to tread the same ground in a different direction. Again, the status of semantics is dubious; if one interprets the kernel of this discipline, along with European-style onomasiology (a refined version of cross-linguistic synonymics; see Quadri), essentially as a subdivision of lexicology, there is little point in attaching it to historical grammar. Is it ever certain that the semantics of a particular language, let us say, of French (cf. the heterogeneous specimens furnished by Ullmann and Gamillscheg), amounts to more than an array of specific illustrations of universal phenomena for which the analyst prefers to draw on a particular source? ¹⁰⁾ A negative answer to this question implies that the writer aims at documenting a series of assumed semantic shifts with French examples, much as he is free to illustrate a set of "accidenti generali" with Italian or, for that matter, Spanish instances, but without any expectation of observing a clear-cut French pattern of changes in meaning comparable in the autonomy and uniqueness of its design to, say, the pattern of French vowel shifts. As regards poetics, a unified discipline truly worthy of this label has not yet emerged, despite a rich and partly very old store of disconnected researches in, on the one hand, metrics, and, on the other, metaphors. Historically projected metric treatises for a given Romance language, contributed by foreigners (A. Tobler, W. Suchier for French) or by natives (T. Navarro for Spanish), have a venerable tradition of their own.

2.3. *Combinations of disciplines.* The rule has been since Diez's pioneer effort for a full-fledged historical grammar to embrace four disciplines (if inflection and word formation for once be counted as two), and for an abridged, inexpensive variety – typically, a textbook suiting the student's budget of time, effort, and money – to include at least two. A unidisciplinary grammar definitely gives the impression of inadequacy or lopsidedness. The grouping of disciplines into bundles

¹⁰⁾ Not insignificant, in this context, is the descriptive subtitle of Hatzfeld's tract: "Versuch einer Zusammenstellung charakteristischen semasiologischen Beispielmateriale aus den bekanntesten Sprachen". It would have been far more difficult to do equal justice to Greek, Latin, French, Spanish, Italian, German, and English on the level of phonology, where each language has its own sharply profiled configuration, making common denominators, for the most part, unobtainable.

is not entirely arbitrary. Two considerations seem to dictate the discernible patterns of arrangement: First, a hierarchy of essentiality, which, rightly or wrongly, tends to assign the humblest position of all to word formation; and, second, a tacit recognition of certain inherent affinities between disciplines – degrees of kinship extending to material examined, method of investigation, and climate of discussion. Thus, since phonology and syntax occupy the two extremes of the spectrum, it would be unthinkable to pair them off to the exclusion of interjacent morphology. These two basic considerations are sometimes locked in unacknowledged conflict. For instance, the scale of essentiality would favor assembling in a tripartite work phonology, inflection, and syntax (a structure which Hanssen, in fact, accepted in 1910), while on the scale of intrinsic affinity phonology, inflection, and word formation might form a more harmonious triad; witness P. Förster's ground-breaking grammar of Spanish and, as of this date at least, the aggregate of Wagner's grammatical researches in Sardinian, provided one agrees to regard each of his three relevant monographs, published independently (1941, 1938–39, 1952, in this unorthodox order), as forming part of an indivisible whole.

There probably exist upward of a hundred manuals in the Romance domain alone – some of them of very ephemeral distinction – that include a bare outline of phonology and inflection. Perhaps this kind of manual, especially if unimaginative in approach, jejune of analytical incisiveness, and derivative in factual information, has contributed more than any other factor to the sad reputation of aridity which research in historical grammar is still widely accorded by impatient humanists. Most of these ventures have been planned, no less by aggressive publishers than by the scholars themselves, either as textbooks or as reference works; relatively few are bold and exploratory. Among the most meritorious, one may cite Cornu's treatise as well as Nunes's and Williams's handbooks, all three concerned with Portuguese. In the Spanish field, Baist's and Pellegrini's outlines are so organized; in the Italian and the Provençal, Grandgent's; in the Old French, Schwan's and Pope's.

The addition of a special chapter or, better still, section on word formation gives a welcome touch of elaboration to a nuclear historical grammar; still incomplete, it becomes middle-sized in topical coverage. A classic example, triadic in content if not in formal arrangement, is

Menéndez Pidal's *Manual (elemental)*. The alternative, we recall, is to expand the bipartite nucleus in the direction of syntax, on the basis of that discipline's priority in real-life situations, especially in practical language teaching.

The quadripartite schema, consecrated by Diez's and Meyer-Lübke's monumental syntheses, underlies Rohlfs's Italian grammar and, on a miniature scale, not a few handy textbooks, e.g., Zauner's for Old Spanish and Huber's for Old Portuguese; Hanssen eventually chose it for a revision of his lifework (1913), and Menéndez Pidal adhered to it in his *Cid* grammar (1908). If the syntax receives more superficial examination than the other disciplines, this disparity may be expressly indicated by the chapter heading (e.g., "Syntaktisches" rather than "Syntax"). ¹¹⁾ Cf. p. 380, fn. 42.

The quinquepartite schema in formal historical grammar has seldom been adopted, though semantics (or semasiology) figures prominently in Zauner's revised pocket-book introduction to Romance linguistics and even occupies a separate volume in Nyrop's historical grammar of French, which visibly aims at completeness. In the 19th century scholars not infrequently toyed with the idea of granting a modest status to "poetics" – usually by way of an excursus or of a supplement to the main corpus; thus, Vol. I (1870) of Diez's revised grammar contains a concluding section on prosody (pp. 486–514), a practice later discontinued. ¹²⁾ A brief (as a rule, introductory) chapter on orthography is a very common, self-explanatory companion feature of a balanced historical phonology and contains the germ of graphe-

¹¹⁾ Even more eloquent than the choice of a non-committal chapter heading is the pathetically inadequate allotment of space to syntax. Gossen's grammar of Old Picard devotes 64 pages to phonology, 21 to inflection, 3 to syntax. Kuhn's monograph on modern Upper Aragonese, held by many to represent a model study, accords a picayunish 6 pages to syntax (for which the author has set aside no separate chapter) as against 106 for phonology, 36 for inflection, and 48 for word formation.

¹²⁾ Diez's closest followers paid sustained attention to this side issue: Reinhardstoettner (1878) included a stylistic and a metric Supplement ("Einzelne Abweichungen vom gewöhnlichen Stile", "Zur portugiesischen Metrik", pp. 393–398), and Förster, two years later, contrived a long opening chapter (pp. 1–56) immersing his readers at once in niceties of pronunciation, prosody, and accentuation. The inclusion of an accentologic account ("Prosodia", pp. 66–76) in García de Diego's grammar (1914) was almost an archaizing feature.

mics, a discipline at this date still in the process of crystallization. The inclusion of lexicographic chapters, as in Bourciez's *Éléments*, has lately been abandoned in formal grammars, though, by the same token, such problems play a deservedly prominent part in less austere conceived "language histories" (see Section 6.2, below).

2.4. Transition to monographs. From a full-fledged historical grammar to a monograph pinpointing an exceedingly narrow problem there exists a continuum of transitions, so that any border-line one elects to draw, including our own (see Section 2.0, above), is doomed to remain arbitrary. After having segregated the monographs as a genre, one may attempt to classify them in the order of decreasing breadth. By way of example, take word formation: After the deduction of full-sized treatises (regardless of the number of languages involved), the residue falls into such studies as attempt to cover the entire territory of derivational suffixation (Allen) or composition (Darmesteter, 1874), such as are concerned solely with productive patterns (Darmesteter, 1877; Pichon), also such as cut across a great variety of allied problems, formally or semantically analyzed (Cohn's inquiry into all manner of suffix change as against Kahane's investigation of the augmentative feminine), or are limited to particular issues rich in methodological implications (Gamillscheg, 1921). Farther down the scale one may place researches in smaller conglomerations of suffixes, e.g., on the formal side, investigations of items erratically stressed (Menéndez Pidal) or epicene (Spitzer); and, on the semantic side, studies in the derivation of mass-nouns (Baldinger) and diminutives (Hasselrot). From here one proceeds to still smaller units, mere molecules of suffixes strung together by a thin thread (say, a single consonant phoneme: cf. Horning, for French, and Menéndez Pidal and Tovar recently teamed up for Spanish). Examples of further progressive atomization would comprise microscopic inquiries into isolated variants (several such experiments have recently been staged in the Luso-Hispanic field, e.g., on *-azo*, *-iego*, *-uno*, and deverbal *-e*), and, still narrower, on fairly unusual "chains" or sequences of formatives (cf. Rohlf's note on Sp. *-arrón*).

Understandably, most pioneers (a strikingly young Fuchs [1840], also Brachet [1866], Horning, Ulrich, and others) were far less reluctant to write monographs straddling several languages than were the cautious scholars of later generations, faced with the task of

meeting higher standards of rigor and of digesting ever-increasing amounts of primary and secondary sources. In the controversial field of Old Spanish sibilants, for instance, the break lies between Joret's and Horning's explicitly comparative approach (excitingly broad-gauged, but somewhat superficial) and, starting with 1894, Cuervo's, Ford's, Saroïhandy's, and Tallgren-Tuulio's concentration on a single language, conducive to distinctly more technical inquiries.

2.5. Combinations with other genres. Under special circumstances a historical grammar may be downgraded to a mere constituent of some broader book venture. If it is attached to a reader (chrestomathy, etc., ¹³) as happens not infrequently in medievalistic and allied researches and especially teaching aids, the question arises as to whether the two sections are approximately on a par (Crescini, Gorra, Alemany Bolufer) and, if not, whether the grammar is a mere introductory prospectus echoed in all likelihood by an appended glossary (Ford; but Appel, content with an inconspicuous morphological sketch ancillary to his chrestomathy, subsequently developed the phonological counterpart into an independent companion piece of considerable weight) or, conversely, whether the reader merely represents a supplement or sampler (Wiese, Tiktin [1905], Zauner, Schultz-Gora, Huber ¹⁴); Behrens's revision of Schwan). In Jordan's Old French

¹³) Note that the once fairly undifferentiated, multi-purpose type of "reader", of the kind familiar from Menéndez Pidal's excellent *Antología de prosistas castellanos* (1899), has started to split up into a variety of well-defined subtypes. The paleographic medievalistic chrestomathy, which has its unsurpassed model in W. Foerster and E. Koschwitz's *Altfranzösisches Übungsbuch* (3d ed., Leipzig, 1907; 7th ed., 1932), contains details so finicky as to be out of place in a strictly literary reader, planned as a companion piece to a history of literature (E. Werner, *Blütenlese der älteren spanischen Literatur*) or designed for esthetic enjoyment (as is true of various anthologies compiled by D. Alonso). The chrestomathy geared to the needs of historical grammar, as distinct from textual criticism and literary analysis, favors extracts from texts dialectally colored (many of them admittedly devoid of literary merit) and as little as possible tampered with by successive scribes. A prototype is the Supplement Volume to the revised Schwan-Behrens grammar; two modern representatives: Šišmarëv's *Kniga dlja čten'ja po istorii francuzskogo jazyka* (for which a separate glossary has been issued) and D. J. Gifford and F. W. Hodcroft's *Textos lingüísticos del medioevo español* (Oxford, 1959).

¹⁴) Where grammatical series were sponsored by well-established publishing houses (such as Winter and Niemeyer in pre-war Germany), the scholar acting

grammar this frame of reference (extracts from the Munich *Brut* and the *Roman de la Rose*) ushers in the analysis.

A brief sketch of historical grammar may likewise precede or follow a dictionary, even one compiled for laymen, – a practice, to be sure, more in accord with late-19th-century historicism than with current trends of taste (*RPh.*, XII, 395, fn. 38). In at least two instances, extensive and influential historical grammars, from the pen of experts, represent opening sections of major dictionaries, as if to whet the reader's appetite or to serve as a wedge for deeper penetration: Coelho's 240-page treatise shared with T. Braga's essay in literary history the honor of heralding Vieira's five-volume dictionary, and A. Darmesteter's authoritative *Traité de la formation de la langue française*, very formally organized and expanded posthumously to even greater length by L. Sudre and A. Thomas, was from the start designed as an entrance gate to the *Dictionnaire général*. The combined grammar and dictionary of a text chosen for its difficulty represent a conventionally delimited piece of research (Fernández Llera).

There are on record subtler ways of subordinating a small historical grammar to a distantly related project which, in exceptional instances, even exceeds the precinct of linguistics.¹⁵ A parsimoniously worded outline of phonology, sometimes in conjunction with inflection, may more or less appropriately form part of a detailed, high-reaching

as counselor or supervisory editor was free to urge the adoption of this pattern which, incidentally, obviated the student's need for purchasing a separate reader. A "language history" was also apt to include a selection of sample texts (Ewert, Pei, Oliver Asín), but Lapesa was doubtless well advised in eliminating this too pedagogically flavored section from all revised editions of his *Historia*.

¹⁵ Except in specialized encyclopedias such as Gröber's, a straight historical grammar is unlikely to share the platform with an outline of literature, though some kind of linguistic survey including chosen features of historical analysis – if at all possible, pruned of burdensome technicalities – may be not unwelcome even to today's general cultured reader. The range of possibilities is best suggested by Darmesteter and Hatzfeld's parallel sixteenth-century *Tableaux*, by an exiled Auerbach's less than successful attempt to impart equal amenity, in his new Turkish homestead, to the teaching of Romance literature and linguistics, and by Meyer-Lübke's readiness to share the spotlight with Morf in a bold synthesis of Romance languages and literatures (1904–09). For unfamiliar cultures of limited scope, such as Raeto-Romance, it makes, of course, excellent sense to offer the few enticeable readers a joint treatment of language, literature, and even folklore; cf. Gartner's *Handbuch*.

“practical” (i.e., normative) grammar, to give it a certain cachet of distinction (Wiggers, Tagliavini). It may likewise find a place in a loosely structured “language history” – to be precise, may represent the solid backbone of that history –, a procedure adopted not only by a succession of pioneers (cf. the miniature phonologies – strictly speaking, lists of correspondences between Spanish and Latin “letters” – in Nebrixa, Sarmiento, etc.), but also by a small rear-guard of moderns (Oliver Asín). Some such epitome may further function as a systematic, succinct recapitulation of remarks haphazardly injected into the introductory pages of a graded textbook, e.g., Voretzsch’s *Einführung* (cf. Parts II and especially IV of its definitive edition). A similar service may be performed by the tight grammatical counterview of a slightly rambling lexicological monograph such as C. Michaëlis’s once valuable, if whimsically mistitled, study of Spanish doublets (1876). There remains the case of a compact historical grammar (e.g., Morel-Fatio’s of Catalan, later partially revised by Saroïhandy, or Gartner’s of Raeto-Romance, or again Tiktin’s of Rumanian) incorporated, from the outset, into a battery of precision instruments jointly trained on the distant past, as one may fittingly call Gröber’s *Grundriß* in nostalgic retrospect.

GRAND STRATEGY

3.0. Definition and subdivision. Under this heading one is tempted to subsume some major strategic arrangements affecting, as a rule, more than one section of a historical grammar and second in importance only to those three discussed under “Scope” (“breadth”, “depth”, and “direction”). One strategic decision concerns the precise delimitation of the disciplines at issue. The treatment of word formation, for instance, – quite aside from the variable degree of detail which it invites – depends on the specific place assigned to it in the book’s total architecture. Most Romance scholars would analyze all questions pertinent to affixation in a separate, unified section, but a minority (including an expert of Menéndez Pidal’s caliber) pairs off, in Indo-Europeanist fashion, nominal derivation with nominal inflection, and verbal derivation with verbal inflection. Again, the border-line between morphology and syntax is quite fluid.

Another far-reaching decision centers around this problem, particu-

larly acute in phonology: If the Romance scholar's chief responsibility is to establish accurate sound correspondences mediating between Latin and Romance, just what place – if any – in this schema should he assign to the substratal layers as well as to Greek, Oscan, Germanic, Arabic, and Slavic strains of the local lexica?

Of even greater significance is the general array of all data within the chosen perspective. At this point, the "standard arrangement", tending to isolate the features and to enumerate them in almost indifferent fashion, may be effectively contrasted with some more imaginative procedures not yet enjoying wide recognition, but opening up distinctly more rewarding vistas. Most attractive and, at the same time, controversial among such experimental arrangements are these: (a) the ordering of events conformally to absolute or relative chronology; (b) their grouping on the basis of such broad categories of linguistic change as assimilation and dissimilation; (c) separate presentation of those changes in which cohesion and mutual conditioning are most clearly discernible, the analyst's ultimate goal being the reinterpretation in structuralistic terms of the aggregate of sound changes within a given system; (d) neat hierarchization of changes in the shape of words (division into [α] genuine phonological drift, [β] "accidenti generali", [γ] associative processes, [δ] effects of diffusion, [ε] effects of expressivism and hypercharacterization, etc.); (e) choice of a pattern of selectivity justified by strictly dynamic considerations.

3.1. *Delimitation of disciplines.* In measuring the "comprehensiveness" of a treatise, i.e., the number of disciplines it purports to encompass (see Section 2.0, above), we took for granted the traditional delimitation of those disciplines and further tacitly assumed that each was self-contained to the point of steering clear of any overlap or tangle. At the initial stage, these were helpful assumptions which enabled us to gauge rapidly, by rule of thumb, the total breadth of a grammar. But, viewed at closer range, such sweeping presuppositions do not always hold water. One detects a good deal of interlocking between disciplines, a state of affairs calling at every step for subjective classificatory decisions.

Though phonology, in its prestructural definition, and syntax, however we may circumscribe it, seem far apart on the conventional scale of disciplines, they abut at one point which the Founding

Fathers appositely called "Satzphonetik" – the conditioning of sound features by the word's position in a sentence. Meyer-Lübke, possibly sensitized to sandhi by his early Indo-Europeanist training, was careful, in 1890, to assemble all relevant observations in a separate chapter ("Das Wort im Satze", pp. 502–522) which flanks another chapter on accent. In his classificatory hierarchy he placed both on the same rung as the obligatory pillars of any conventional phonology: the chapters on vowels and consonants. Neither syntactic phonology nor accentology have later occupied positions of comparable prominence in Romance diachronic research, no doubt as a partial result of the relative stability of Latin stress and of the subordinate role of pitch, here consistently non-distinctive. If at all separately examined, syntactic phonology is relegated to an inconspicuous position toward the end of the phonological section (Menéndez Pidal, *Cid* grammar; Nunes, *Compêndio*).

Graphemics (less pretentiously, the study of spelling habits) is normally so lodged within the total framework as to herald the tabulation of sound changes, thus forming a natural bridge from paleography to linguistics proper. This optional excursus has been particularly dear to the medievalist steeped in archival research (cf. the routine treatment by Förster, Wiggers, Baist, Cornu, Grandgent [1905], Huber, Williams, and many others, typically in the opening section of the book, as against Menéndez Pidal's masterly comments in the Introduction to his *Orígenes*).¹⁶ Conversely, syntax is ordi-

¹⁶) Occasionally, the chapter on orthography is transposed to a different part. Fuchs (1849) discusses "Lautbezeichnung und Lautverhältnisse" at a fairly advanced point of his treatise (pp. 296–310); Menéndez Pidal's *Cid* grammar (1908) assigns to the topic "Alfabeto y pronunciación" a secluded spot at the end of phonology (pp. 207–230); García de Diego's *Elementos* (1914) pigeonholes orthography between accentology and semantics (pp. 77–93). Numerous modern linguists, convinced that their science deals with sounds, not with script, go out of their way to omit or to screen references to letters; to whet the reader's historical curiosity, Deferrari's Phonology of Italian hastens to introduce him from the start to the sounds of that language (pp. 129–140), not to their symbolic representation. Some languages, famous as vehicles of literature, hence often visually absorbed, invite keener attention to their spelling than do others; French orthography is so erratic, hence exciting, as to have elicited separate medium-sized chapters in such up-to-date manuals as Ewert's (1933) and Pope's (1934).

narily divested of references to the decipherment and presentation of manuscripts. This distribution of alliances and affinities flows mainly not from logical necessity, but from convention, which Foulet had the courage to defy in his *Petite syntaxe*, where he reserved a Supplement (3d ed., pp. 345–374) for the syntactic implications of a medievalist's analysis of manuscript transmission.

There is no predicting where references to the marginally recognized disciplines will be accommodated. While García de Diego (1914) reserves a separate chapter for semantics, Bourciez, in the opening section of his *Éléments*, and, much more fully, Ewert examine changes of meaning under Vocabulary, a privilege incident to the choice of language history in preference to historical grammar. In classical scholarship, old-fashioned stylistics, i.e., rhetoric, normally follows upon syntax; cf. J. B. Hofmann's revision (1928) of Stolz-Schmalz. Poetics (metrics, versification) one expects to find in a Supplement (Wiggers) or in a concluding section (Nunes, *Crestomatia*; Brunot-Bruneau, *Précis*); in Crescini's *Manuale* (1926) the "Appunti ritmici" form a natural bridge from grammar to reader. Finally, some eccentric scholars operate with fancy disciplines; thus, García de Diego (1951) thought up a twenty-two page chapter on "analogy" (phonological, morphological, and syntactic) which drives a most inopportune wedge between phonology and morphology.

3.2. Subordination of disciplines. In our initial schema the basic disciplines were introduced as peers, with equal claims on the linguist's attention, provided he cares at all to include them in his purview. The actual picture looks quite different: While Diez and Meyer-Lübke were careful to allocate approximately equal space to inflection and to word formation, many smaller grammars reduce the latter to a short catalogue of characteristic prefixes and suffixes, nonchalantly appended, by way of supplement, to a rather full discussion of declension and conjugation (one such offender is Huber; for similar treatment of syntax as a stepchild see fn. 11, above). In Gartner's *Darstellung* a synopsis of "Wortbildung" (pp. 141–149) is bizarrely wedged in between phonology and morphology, i.e., inflection.¹⁷

¹⁷ Cf., however, the following footnote. Here are examples of further unusual niches carved out for derivation and composition. In "language histories", from Fuchs's (1849) to Bourciez's (*Éléments*, 1910: see Part I, Section 3) and Ewert's (1933), an independent lexical chapter which would have been inad-

In his major writings (*Manual*, *Cid* grammar, *Origenes* – see 3d ed., § 329), Menéndez Pidal has split up the arsenal of affixes, attaching the nominal group to the discussion of declension and the verbal group to the analysis of conjugation – a legitimate practice, widely adopted by Indo-Europeanists,¹⁸) but here conducive to loss of rank.

Unlikely as it seems at first glance that phonology and word formation should intersect, both editions (1888, 1906) of Cornu's Portuguese grammar contain a fairly detailed catalogue of suffixes, with appropriate illustrations, hidden away in, of all places, the chapter on stressed vowels.¹⁹) The reason – no valid excuse – for this strange

missible in a straight historical grammar, has most opportunely provided the requisite quarters. Rohlfs, inexplicably, placed syntax ahead of word formation (1954).

¹⁸) Thus, M. Leumann, in his revision (1928) of Stolz-Schmalz's morphology, divides the section on the noun (pp. 199–300) into a chapter on "Stammbildung" largely, though not exclusively, concerned with derivational suffixes (pp. 199–254), and a shorter chapter on inflection (pp. 255–300). The Indo-Europeanist tradition (whose course, in turn, was by and large determined by the material available) calls for this peculiar sequence; witness also Chap. IV ("Nouns and adjectives") in Sturtevant's *Comparative grammar of the Hittite language* (1933), in which word formation clearly takes precedence over declension. This succession has been almost unparalleled in Romance scholarship except at its incipient stage. In the twilight period between Diez's and Meyer-Lübke's grammars some minor practitioners deviated from the established canon. Thus, C. von Reinhardstoettner (1878) wedged in a lengthy chapter on "Wortbildung" (pp. 111–156) between the sections on Portuguese phonology and inflection, and T. Gartner followed suit as late as 1904; P. Förster regaled the readers of his erudite Spanish grammar (1880) with a long hybrid section titled "Sprachschatz und Wortbildung" (pp. 159–239) similarly placed, or rather misplaced. In G. Meyer's account of Albano-Latin (1888), word formation, ranked as a constituent of morphology, anteceded declension and conjugation. It was the prestige of Meyer-Lübke's tone-setting Italian grammar (1890) and comparative grammar (1894) that swung the pendulum back to its initial position (Diez). Outside the I.-E. province, L. Bloomfield showed greater restraint in his concluding works than as a young experimenter. Thus, in the posthumous *Eastern Ojibwa* (which reflects his thinking as of the early 'forties), the chapters on Composition, Suffixation, and Roots form, conservatively enough, a bridge from Inflection to Syntax, while in his much earlier *Tagalog Texts* (1917) Syntax (pp. 146–205) was allowed to separate Phonetics (pp. 134–145) from Morphology (pp. 210–316).

¹⁹) Thus, *-elo* (*-êlo*) < *-ELLU* is discussed under *Ē* (§§ 5–6), *-ego* < *-AECU* under *AE* (§ 8), *-edo* < *-ÊTU* and *-ês* < *-Ē(N)SE* under *Ē* (§ 9), *-eza* < *-ITIA*, *-ez* < *-ITIE*,

distribution is that, only if propelled by a stressed vowel, did Latin suffixes survive into Romance.

Given the importance of morphophonemics in several schools of modern descriptivism, it is wholesome to recall that some classic historical grammars acknowledged the existence of a "domain" (at that time "level" was not yet current) where phonological alternation coincided with morphological variation, the whole viewed in diachronic perspective. There remained the problem of discovering the proper niche for this elusive field. Cornu titled a supplement (§§ 41–65) to his chapter on stressed vowels in Portuguese "Comportment of stressed vowels in verbs and non-suffixal verbal substantives", adding, for good measure, such stray remarks on the strong preterite as should properly have fallen under apophony and metaphony. Conversely, Menéndez Pidal's *Cid* grammar opens its discussion of the verb with a statement (pp. 260–264) on the "Peculiarities of verbal vocalism".

3.3. Reshuffling of disciplines. Allowances for minor inter-disciplinary encroachments and for the unequal rating of disciplines, in terms of classification and of space allotment, blur our initially clear vision of several analyses, each neatly delineated, yet all harmoniously coördinated. Fundamentally, however, they imply continued recognition of the separate existence of the disciplines originally posited. One visualizes far more radical departures from the standard, leading to the reapportionment of the entire material or, at least, of a liberal part of it among a differently ordered set of basic disciplines.

Some schools of general linguistics insist on abolishing the borderline between morphology (or, at least, inflection) and syntax (or certain provinces of syntax). On the whole, this reform, despite its endorsement by Brunot-Bruneau, Ewert, and Rohlfs in the early 'thirties, has so far had little effect on the main stream of Romance historical linguistics, conceivably because under the surrounding circumstances it is decidedly impractical.

Yet Romance scholarship has not been entirely immune to such trends. As early as the first revision (1905) of his pocket-sized Romance

-elho < -IC(U)LU, *-ete* < -IUUU [sic], and, less convincingly, *-ivel* < -IBILE, *-ice* < -ITIE, *-iço* < -ICIU, *-ilho* < -IC(U)LU under ĭ (§§ 12–13, 15; -ICLU, Cornu admits, is the alternative), *-inho* < -ĪNU, *-il* < -ĪLE, *-io* < -IUU, *-iço* < -ĪTIU [but cf. above], and *-ijem* < -IGINE under ĭ (§§ 16–17), etc.

grammar, Zauner sliced his material into three pieces, inserting as a separate category of equal rank between (a) a succinct phonology and (c) a mere sketch ("Grundzüge") of syntax, his (b) "Wortlehre", an amalgam of (α) inflection, (β) old-style semantics, (γ) certain sections of syntax centered about the individual word, and (δ) word formation.²⁰ Zauner's enthusiasm for this mould spilled over, in slightly dampened form, into his introductory Old Spanish grammar, whose "Wortlehre" (pp. 65-123; 2d ed., pp. 56-109) embraces traditional morphology plus a chapter-length digression slanted in the direction of function ("Verwendung der Wortformen").

3.4. *Merger or separation of different strains.* The task of the Romance grammarian is singularly complicated by the fact that, in addition to the prevalent Latin stratum, he has to deal intermittently

²⁰) This unorthodox section, straddling the two tiny volumes, deserves an extra measure of attention. It falls into three main chapters, of which the first deals with inflection ("Die Lehre von den Wortformen", I, 120-169) and the last, with word formation ("Wortbildungslehre", II, 60-82). It is the central core (II, 9-59), titled "Die Lehre von der Bedeutung der Wörter", that was primarily meant to represent the innovation. This kernel falls, in turn, into three subchapters, of which the first (pp. 10-25), most infelicitously, bears the same title as the whole and boils down to a brief treatise of conventional semasiology dealing with the causes, "laws", and chief varieties of semantic shift. The second subchapter, "Bedeutung der Wortformen" (pp. 26-47), is concerned with syntactic implications of morphological change, such as the contrast between gender and sex, the pluralization of proper names, mass nouns, abstracts, etc.: "... die Bedeutung der Wortformen kommt hier nur insofern zur Sprache, als sie sich am alleinstehenden Wort zeigt; wenn es sich um die Bedeutung handelt, die eine Wortform im Verhältnis zu einer anderen hat, so haben wir ein Wortgefüge vor uns, das also in der Syntax zu behandeln ist" (p. 26). The third (pp. 48-59), again badly mistitled ("Bedeutung der Wortarten"; a more appropriate heading, to use the author's own terminology, might have been "Verschiebungen zwischen den Wortarten"), deals with such extensions of form classes as the adjectival, pronominal, adverbial, and prepositional use of an erstwhile substantive, and vice versa, - an elusive point of grammar which other scholars, dubbing it "*dérivation impropre*", incline to treat under word formation, and yet others, possibly the majority, under syntax. The original edition (1900), in a single volume of the Götschen series, displayed an even queerer structure, lamely placing, on the temporal level of Vulgar Latin, some unannounced random remarks on semantic change (pp. 37-38) which separate the sections on word formation and syntax, while on the plateau of Romance the topics were austere confined to phonology and inflection, followed by a two-page excursus on word formation.

with other ingredients or "strains". Whereas the lexicographer may, at will, comfortably segregate, say, the Italianisms in Spanish (Terlingen) or the Gallicisms in Dutch (Salverda de Grave) or else intermingle them with other words,²¹⁾ the tighter structure of grammar saddles its practitioner with entirely different responsibilities. A separate phonology of Arabic words absorbed into Ibero-Romance and South Italian, such as Steiger's, is an ever-present possibility; but what of the share of attention to be given to the pre-IE, Celtic, Greek, and Germanic lexical ingredients within the total fabric of pan-Romantic, or of a single Romance, phonology? Diez's initial answer to this question, in his original comparative grammar, rests squarely on a – in retrospect, arbitrary – dichotomy of Latin (pp. 116–269) and German[ic] (pp. 270–332) "letters", i.e., sounds, followed by a meager Supplement on Arabic sounds in Spanish (pp. 332–334). The definitive version of his grammar shows a thorough reorganization: A newly carved-out section, "The sounds of the source languages", forms the ground floor of the restructured edifice (pp. 120–270), and only here are Latin and Germanic consistently contrasted, while in the concluding section, an upper story devoted to the six languages chosen for separate consideration, a unified treatment prevails. Reinhardstoettner followed in the late Diez's footsteps, except that for him the "source languages" of Portuguese were Latin and Arabic, to the detriment of Germanic, while Förster reverted to a single chapter on the "Origin of Spanish sounds". Subsequent generations discarded Diez's approach; thus, Meyer-Lübke's French grammar makes almost casual mention of such significant imports from Old Frankish as the phonemes /h/ and /w/ (see Vol. I, §§ 154–155).²²⁾ This streamlining offers certain

²¹⁾ Note, however, that W. von Wartburg, possibly for practical reasons, changed the structure of his *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* in mid-stream, as it were: the concluding volumes strictly segregate lexical families of Latin, Germanic, and substratal provenience.

²²⁾ It has proved virtually impossible to build the fragmentarily reconstructed substratum languages into the edifice of a formal historical grammar, though it is not at all difficult, in a straight language history, to reserve for their vestiges a separate chapter, even one of considerable length and elaboration; cf. Savj-Lopez's and Tagliavini's *Origini* and the almost overburdened opening chapter of Lapesa's *Historia*. Language histories are equally hospitable to superstrata, cf. Vol. I of Densusianu's lifework, with its detailed account of Bulgarian,

advantages; it also involves the drawback of deēmphasizing the – to the structuralist – all-important interplay between internal sound development, geared to trends of inner economy, and the enrichment of a phonic stock as a result of external pressure (ethnolinguistic contacts through peaceful diffusion or conquests). A truly satisfactory solution of this inherent dilemma has not yet been devised. ²³⁾

Just as a scholar may concentrate on a collateral strain within Romance, so a minor Latin or Romance strain discernible within a language adjudged, on general grounds, to a different family may be made the

Serbian, Polish, Albanian, Byzantine, Hungarian, and Cumanian infiltrations.

Makeshift solutions in grammars and near-grammars include the phonologically evasive discussion of such strains in the Introduction (Pellegrini) and the relegation of the topic to the equally non-committal chapter on vocabulary (Ewert: "Borrowed words", pp. 282–305), while in Nunes's *Compêndio* the separate phonology of Germanic and Arabic words in Portuguese (pp. 161–184) marks a late echo of Diez's program.

The degree of close attention paid to Latin varies from author to author. Elcock has devoted one third of his synthesis to the "Latin foundation" (pp. 17–169) and has very wisely assigned a whole prominent section (pp. 300–333) to the afterglow of the parent language ("Medieval Latin and Romance vernacular"). Students of Romance have, in the nature of things, rarely been accomplished Latinists, with the exception of the Italian group, notably G. Devoto. Through a startling division of labor, Romance linguists, while demonstrating, from Ascoli and Schuchardt via Bertoldi to Hubschmid, a touching readiness to delve into the study of recalcitrant archaic substrata, have for the most part been content to scratch the surface of Latin and have practically never ventured into Proto-I.-E., at least not in their manuals (a lone, probably well-meant exception is the introductory chapter to the *History of the French Language* by Holmes and Schutz).

²³⁾ The precise place assigned to the substratum depends on one important decision: Does the author primarily examine the linguistic layers of a fixed territory (say, Gaul or Iberia), or the gradual spread of Latin from its Roman fountainhead? If the former is true, Latin quite naturally falls into place between the succession of native substrata and any number of superstrata or "parastrata", cf. Entwistle's account of Ibero-Romance (1936), Pellegrini's of Old Spanish (1950), and Alessio's of French (1946). If the alternative is favored, the multifarious contacts of Latin with other languages invite discussion at a point, or at points, considerably removed from the Introduction. In this event, the writer retains his freedom of choice between (a) telescoping the accounts of all such interferences, as did P. Savj-Lopez in his composite Chap. V ("Tracce preromane e influssi estranei", pp. 251–317), and (b) sharply segregating early from late non-Latin influences, as was Elcock's, all told, more judicious decision in 1960.

object of special investigation. Take G. Meyer's grammatical analysis (the accent being, as expected, on phonology) of the Latin ingredients in Albanian, a "Mischsprache" par excellence; this monograph later acquired an added touch of authority through its revision by Meyer-Lübke. Ordinarily, in studies of this kind grammar takes second place behind lexicology; thus, one would look in vain for a grammatical presentation of colloquial Latin elements in Celtic and Germanic equal in finesse and cogency to Jud's lexical bird's-eye view in his classic "Altromanische Sprachgeographie".

3.5. Novel arrangements. While some scholars were busy refining the older approaches or reconciling certain discrepancies between them, real or apparent, others, more venturesome, have struck out anew, with fresh criteria for assembling data. Of these experiments a few, at least in their embryonic stage, go back to the concluding years of the past century; nevertheless one is at liberty to call them all "modernistic". Since experimenters, as a rule, display notable perceptiveness, they – and such critics as were no less alert – have, on the whole, been aware of the margin of imbalance and often downright error that any untested arrangement is likely to involve. The feeling in these quarters has been that, since stagnation represents the worst enemy of scientific advance, any well-conducted experiment, even if it merely opens up an unsuspected alternative to the accepted order of things, constitutes a sound investment of intellectual power.

3.5.1. Chronological sequence. The importance of absolute and relative chronology must have dawned early on language historians, but the precise way of operating with these constructs, especially with the latter, which hinges on strict logical extrapolation rather than on philological "Einfühlung", must from the start have caused embarrassment; witness Otto Bremer's long hesitancy about publishing his "Relative Sprachchronologie", drafted in Leipzig as early as July 1885, until after he had thoroughly recast it in Halle more than eight years later (*IF*, IV [1894], 8–31). The early record of Romance scholarship along this line was impressive, ever since Meyer-Lübke's solid nineteen-page analysis, "Zur Chronologie des Lautwandels", found a niche as a separate chapter in his *Lautlehre* (1890). Unfortunately, the discussion picked up momentum quite slowly; a narrow path leads to the laconic, but admirably comprehensive "Historische Übersicht der Lautveränderungen", appended in 1908 as the Second Supplement (I,

261–262; pp. 266–267 in rev. ed.) to the same author's revolutionary French grammar, where it acted as a foil to the equally helpful and incisive "Systematische Übersicht..." (pp. 252–260), more in the nature of a synopsis or restatement. The next step was E. Richter's programmatic paper (1910–11) – significantly dedicated to her teacher Meyer-Lübke – on the inner connection in the growth of Romance languages. After another quarter-century of unremitting research, she achieved the break-through in her book-length *Geschichte der Romanismen*, which modesty prompted her to qualify as mere *Beiträge*, incontrovertibly a brilliant contribution to Romance and, in an even truer sense, to general linguistics.²⁴)

Richter's ambition was to segment the entire phonic trajectory of proto-French, ranging from Latin at its all-time peak down to Gallo-Romance as spoken in the late 8th century, into approximately 170 successive shifts, arranged with little regard to the point and mode of articulation (through a twist of irony, she lavished on each shift meticulous physiologic comment). Since the one overriding consideration was temporal priority or posteriority, shifts closely allied when viewed in more familiar perspectives were torn asunder if relative chronology suggested the occurrence of other changes, whatever their locus, in the intervenient lapse of time. Take, for instance, the syncope of the posttonic vowel: Richter here distinguished six basic stages, not necessarily reached in close succession, and further split the second and the third into two almost consecutive phases. These assumptions led to the following schema (the bare paragraph numbers suffice to indicate the suggested distances, if not in time, at least in evolutionary stage, since each paragraph was assigned to just one such step):

§ 10: First syncope (*calidus* > *caldus*);

§ 60: Second syncope [I] (*aliquid* > **alqued*);

§ 69a: Second syncope [II] (*uincere* > **veptre*);

²⁴) The following extracts from E. Richter's Preface (pp. 2–3) to her *Beiträge* conveys the flavor of deep dissatisfaction with past achievements which, of necessity, underlies the restlessness of avant-garde workers: "Wir besitzen zahlreiche 'historische' Grammatiken ... Aber eine Geschichte der sprachlichen Entwicklung geben sie nicht. Verfolgen sie doch den zumeist nach physiologischem Gesichtspunkt gegliederten Stoff in seinen Teilerscheinungen je über alle Jahrhunderte, ohne Rücksicht darauf, welche dieser Teilerscheinungen früher, welche später, welche erst infolge der anderen entstanden ist".

- § 109: Third syncope [I] (**limete* > **limte*);
 § 111: Third syncope [II] ([*fēmīna*] > **femna*);
 § 130: Fourth syncope ([*ductile*] > **doille*);
 § 144: Fifth syncope ([*galbinu*] > **dzalbne*);
 § 173: Last shortenings (*for^adzet* > *forge*).

Despite the rigor of this "Hilfskonstruktion für die Erfassung des sprachgeschichtlichen Vorganges" and the élan, even verve, characterizing the entire venture,²⁵⁾ Richter's method and underlying assumptions invite serious objections. Thus, to the extent that precedence and causation are interwoven, one phonetic shift seems to be produced by a constellation of others – in splendid isolation, whereas in reality the ensemble of contributing circumstances is discernibly more complex. In principle, the author emphatically recognized the collateral agency of psychic forces ("nur im Zusammenhang mit anderen psychischen Vorgängen"), but, in practice, she failed to heed the constant interplay of even phonology and morphology.²⁶⁾ Then again, though Richter's introductory remarks show an astonishingly firm grasp of the regional and social (or educational) gradation of Latin, she presupposed, in the course of her actual operations, an almost

²⁵⁾ A few passages may be adduced as evidence: "Daß die chronologische Darstellung von keinem der früheren Meister unternommen wurde, wirft ein Licht auf die Bedenken, die sie gegen die Ausführung hatten, wegen der nahezu unüberwindlichen Schwierigkeiten und der Aussichtslosigkeit, eine solche Aufgabe wissenschaftlich einwandfrei zu lösen. Doch reizt sie wie die Restaurierung eines alten Mosaiks, eines antiken, in tausend Scherben daliegenden Vasenbildes. Gewiß, es wird irgendeiner Gestalt der Kopf fehlen, der anderen ein Gewandzipfel usw. Aber durch die Zusammenfügung wird doch ein lebendiges Ganzes 'auf die Füße' gestellt, während bisher die Stücke nebeneinander lagen und von den wenigsten als zusammengehöriges Eines erfaßt werden können. Die ungeheure Mehrzahl der Betrachter sieht nur ein Nebeneinander ohne die Fähigkeit, das Gemälde lebend vor sich erstehen zu lassen".

²⁶⁾ This limitation was not entirely due to neglect. Richter justified it by a theory, sketched in Section VIII of her Introduction, to the effect that the genuinely "historical method", which makes ample allowances for lacunae, is acceptable in certain linguistic disciplines such as word formation and syntax, whereas phonology, which she defined as being essentially 'a phonetic history of unconscious imperfect transmissions', stands completely apart through its link to physiological processes open to scientific inspection – and, in her opinion, to equally rigorous reconstruction and prediction (pp. 18–19). Note the lapidary pronouncement: "Die chronologische Phonetik ist in erster Linie Phonetik".

complete lack of territorial differentiation throughout the first six centuries. Making good her original promise (p. 62) "das unleugbar vorhandene alte Sprachmaterial im Lichte der experimentellen physiologischen (resp. sprachpsychologischen) Forschung zu zeigen", a perfectly valid program in 1910, she relied too heavily, for the experts' taste twenty-four years later, on the phonetic laboratory, and too little, despite occasional flirting with "early-Prague-style" phonology, on the new and fruitful concept of close-knit sound-system and such ramifications of structuralistic thinking as "phonetic yield". Finally, her inability to grapple with the problem of other Romance developments, an inability of which she was painfully aware and which she candidly attributed not only to such trivial causes as overexertion, but also to insoluble intrinsic complications ("weil die Gestaltung der verschiedenartigen nebeneinanderlaufenden Entwicklungen ein kaum zu lösendes Problem aufgibt"), explains why her *Beiträge*, despite their extraordinary sophistication, not only remained a torso, but, worse, failed to inspire younger workers with the desire to emulate and surpass this venture of a lone explorer.

3.5.2. Transformational categories. Historical grammar has at all times, by definition, been concerned with change, but normally operates with material classified on the basis of static – or panchronic – categories, such as sounds arranged according to steady physiological conditions or to their positions in higher units (words, phrases), suffixes detached from the vocabulary at given evolutionary stages, and the like. One can imagine a radically different array, involving categories established on the basis not of what the items represent in a static cross-section, but of the type of change (assimilation, dissimilation, vocalization of a consonant and consonantization of a vowel, loss, restoration, confusion, etc.) which the analyst supposes these items to have undergone. Such an approach is apt to lead eventually to a typology of linguistic transformation, of the broad-gauged kind envisaged by general students of language from Paul via Sturtevant to Hoenigswald.

A perspective so bold, opening up from the most abstract level of analysis, concerns us here only to the extent that the historical grammar of a single language (or, less likely, of a language family) may be rearranged to fit this schema. The choice of such a model would make the grammar difficult of casual consultation or even devoid of interest

for, say, the philologist or etymologist, but may vastly enhance its value as a tool of straight linguistic research.

One may envisage either a complete or a partial adoption of this schema. A very notable example of the former, available only in fragmentary form and scarcely known even to experts, is Chap. 2 ("Alteración fonética") in the distinguished Colombian R. J. Cuervo's posthumous treatise *Castellano popular y castellano literario* (unfinished; far advanced ca. 1905; published in 1944). His manner of presentation stems from the following synopsis ²⁷:

I. Spontaneous shift (pp. 45-106)

1. Vowels [in general]
2. Consonants [in general]
3. Special developments (A. Fronting; B. Vocalization [of consonants] and consonantization [of vowels]; C. Loss; D. Aspiration; E. [Interchange of consonants]; F. Confusion and false regression.

II. Combinatory shift (pp. 106-242)

1. Consecutive phonemes (pp. 107-179)
 - A. Vowels (a. Total assimilation; b. Partial assimilation; c. Dissimilation; d. Confusion and false regression)
 - B. Consonants (a. Total assimilation; b. Learned reaction to ancient vernacular pronunciation; c. Partial assimilation; d. Dissimilation)
 - C. Consonants and vowels (a. Total assimilation; b. Partial assimilation)

²⁷ I am the less hesitant to offer it in translation since Cuervo's *Obras inéditas*, as a book venture, represents a queer mixture of accomplishments and failures. The volume is fastidiously printed and equipped with an almost exhaustive bibliography (p. xiii), but it lacks so elementary a feature as a Table of Contents, doubly important in a congeries of fragments, - to say nothing of the absent word index. Cuervo's own desultory blueprint (p. ix) indicates that the fragment unearthed represents, at best, the initial quarter of the entire project, Parts II-IV having been reserved, respectively, for "Analogy" (including its impact on words [i.e., root morphemes], inflection, word formation, and contiguous areas of syntax and semantics), "semasiology" (with one of four chapters devoted to the study of metaphors), and "vocabulary" (segregation of archaic, provincial, and indigenous items, in this order). As regards the date, in the Preface (p. xxiv) to the 5th ed. (1905) of his classic *Apuntaciones* Cuervo described himself as engrossed in the writing of this new treatise; the year of his death (1911) provides the *terminus ad quem*. Tantalizing is the question: Did Cuervo abandon this project on account of old-age infirmity, or, a dramatic alternative, because he ultimately despaired of its feasibility?

2. Separate phonemes (pp. 180-242)

- A. Vowels (a. Total assimilation; b. Dissimilation; c. Partial assimilation; d. Assimilation through epenthesis and dissimilation through syncope)
- B. Consonants (a. Assimilation [α . Nasals; β . Liquids; γ . Other phonemes]; b. Dissimilation; c. Assimilation and dissimilation combined). ²⁸⁾

If we may, for once, apply the labels "static" and "dynamic" to the contrast between array and development (rather than to anatomy vs. physiology of sound production), Cuervo clearly left the barest minimum of static categories, such as, on a pervasive scale, the age-old division into vowels and consonants and, at a single inconspicuous point (II2Ba), the further subdivision of the consonants on the basis of locus of articulation. In every other respect, purely dynamic categories, suggestive of evolution, prevail in his pattern. One visualizes further progress along this line through complete elimination of residual static features and through simultaneous extension of the transformational model to, at least, morphology and syntax. ²⁹⁾

Significantly, almost every small, even smallest, division in Cuervo's schema, as here reported in crudely simplified form, is actually split into even shorter units, of paragraph length:

A case in point is the dissimilation of non-contiguous consonants (for which the author could afford to rely on Grammont's spadework), here

²⁸⁾ In translating, I have gently retouched the headings; the one attached in the original to I3E makes little sense, and the replacement, inferred from the content, has the merit of echoing A. Alonso's label for the same phenomenon (*NRFH*, I [1947], 1-10). One detects an occasional instance of overlapping, as when, in the face of Section I3F (pp. 101-106), the shorter Section II1 Ad (pp. 126-128) seems redundant: In a final revision, that perfectionist Cuervo would no doubt have consolidated the two.

²⁹⁾ By way of background, note that the long chapter here examined is preceded by a full-blown treatment of "General phonetics" (pp. 7-41) - based on the writings of Sweet, Sievers, Passy, and Storm -, at that time far and away the safest available guide to Spanish. It is followed by three shorter chapters whose ultimate status and destination remain dubious - they almost give the impression of unintegrated articles or monographs: III. Accentuation (divided into two untitled subchapters); IV. Diphthongization; V. Syllabic count of successive vowels. Cuervo's principal authorities for the chapter on sound shift were, by his own admission (p. 43, fn.), Baist, Brugmann, Meyer-Lübke, Passy, Paul, Schuchardt, and Sievers, a splendid testimonial to his versatility.

marked as Section II2Bb; it falls into numerous units more narrowly circumscribed, typified by (α) *árbol* 'tree', (β) (*co*)*frade* 'fellow member', (γ) *palafrén* 'palfrey', (δ) obs. *acipreste* 'archpriest', (ε) *alambre* 'wire', (ζ) *fiambre* 'cold meat', (η) *medrar* 'thrive', etc.

An average historical grammar would tend to separate points here forcefully brought together, such as *-mb-* (= *-nv-*) > *-m-*, *-rl-* > *-l-* or *-ll-* [λ], *-nm-* > *-m-*, *-sr-* > *-rr-* [r], whose common denominator happens to be "Total assimilation of contiguous consonants" (Section II1Ba).

One finds partial rather than integral adoption of this approach by way of compromise with more conventional groupings. Twenty years before Cuervo, Cornu introduced into his Portuguese grammar such sections as (α) "Assimilation of vowels to vowels" (§§ 81–88) and (β) "Assimilation of vowels to consonants" (§§ 89–97; repeated in 2d ed.). The difference between the two treatises consists in this: In Cuervo's schema, these broad headings, cutting across the vicissitudes of individual sounds in all positions or of certain sounds in restricted positions, constitute the major divisions; in Cornu's, they occupy a distinctly lower classificatory rank: The two quoted items jointly form Subsection (b) of Section (B), on unstressed vowels, which, in turn, enters into Chap. 2 ("Sound development") of Phonology, the opening part of the entire grammar. See further our Section 3.5.9.

3.5.3. Geographic focus: sharp, diffuse, or scattered. An explorer concerned, in Munthe's and Sánchez Sevilla's footsteps, with the risky task of preparing the historical grammar of a single village patois operates, by definition, with a sharp geographic focus, especially if the field-work interviews are restricted to natives. Conversely, any historical grammar of a widespread language (say, French or Spanish) ordinarily carries with it deëmphasis of locale, i.e., a diffuse geographic focus; the great novelty of Menéndez Pidal's *Orígenes* (if, for the sake of the argument, we take this work to represent a grammar) was the author's constant attention to locus, despite the immense territorial sweep.

One can speak of a scattered focus only where each ancestral form contrasts with a profusion of neatly pinpointed reflexes, of which none occupies any position of cultural or territorial preëminence with regard to the others. The classic instance is Gartner's oft-repeated treatment of Raeto-Romance, as shown particularly in the Supplement (pp. 166–200) to his *Grammatik* (1883), throughout both editions of his

contribution – characteristically titled “Die rätoromanischen Mundarten” – to Gröber’s *Grundriß*, and in his crowning achievement, the *Handbuch* (1910), where a typographic device in the list of etyma (pp. xvii–xx) immediately draws the reader’s attention to those passages in which a single Latin base was surrounded by from fifty to seventy Raeto-Romance, Lombard, and Venetian offshoots. Formal grammars in which the scattered focus is used on a wide scale, though less ostentatiously, include Ronjat’s for Occitanian, Rohlfs’s for Italian, and whatever Wagner has so far contributed toward one for Sardinian.

3.5.4. The structural approach. Any structural approach to historical grammar involves – ideally, at least – the thorough integration of all individual shifts into a single complex pattern of interdependent moves, in chessboard fashion. Large-scale structural grammars so conceived are not yet available in Romance and may never come into existence. Even on a descriptive plane, structure, as L. Hjelmslev specifically admits (*AcL*, IV: 3, p. v), is little more than a seductive hypothesis; the chances of its fruitful application to language history are severely limited by the fact that the ubiquitous extralinguistic influences (which lend themselves with difficulty, if at all, to stringent patterning) seem inextricably interwoven with purely linguistic developments. Additional complications stem from the circumstance that, when structuralism put forth its first blossoms, Romance linguistic scholarship was veering at full speed in the opposite direction. The result of this disharmony is that major monographs impregnated with experimental structuralistic thinking, yet, at the same time, written by authors in full command of solid traditional learning, such as Kuryłowicz’s researches in Indo-European accent and apophony, lack any worthy counterparts on the Romance side. Demonstrably, even scholars familiar at first hand with structuralistic tenets and terminology, such as Lausberg, exhibit studied restraint, not to say conservatism, in their attempts at broader syntheses. Since the few available inquiries diachronically oriented hark back to the Prague School, an expected emphasis on phonology, to the point of imbalance, is clearly in evidence; cf. Haudricourt and Juillard’s reinterpretation of French, which critics call rashly conceived and no less rashly executed; Alarcos Llorach’s researches in Spanish, flanking a full-length synchronic treatment; and, quite recently, H. Weinrich’s ambitious venture into general Romance, with heightened attention

to Italian dialects. Despite its rather immodest claims, structuralism has in fact scored its finest successes in neatly bounded fields, cf. Martinet's model studies in, on the one hand, Romance occlusives and homorganic spirants and, on the other, the early modern Spanish sibilants. Such "privileged areas" in the diachronic projection of grammatical structure remind one of those equally privileged sectors of the lexicon, viewed either descriptively or historically, which display particularly clear-cut patterning, such as numerals beside anatomic and kinship terms.

3.5.5. *Hierarchization of sound shifts.* Whether or not one elects to adopt the structuralistic platform, it seems possible, in theory, to hierarchize linguistic change, especially in the realm of phonology. The grammars in which our analyses are encoded have lagged appreciably behind the new theoretical insights. Possibly as far-reaching in its reverberations as the neo-grammarians' celebrated dictum denying that "sound-laws" tolerate any exceptions has been the modern discovery – carried to its logical conclusion by L. Bloomfield (1933) – that in the section on phonology only straight phonological change, i.e., the smooth, undeflected workings of standard sound correspondences, should be subjected to close scrutiny. A phonology so constructed would be relieved of constant reference to the numerous "exceptions" which, in reality, represent so many results of heterogeneous conflicts between, on the one hand, the interplay of basic sound shifts and, on the other, totally different forces operative in language history.

If phonology is to be restricted to the analysis of genuine phonological sound shift (Sapir's "drift") rather than of any change whatsoever observable in the fabric of words, the corollary is that an appropriate place must be found to discuss or, at least, briefly record other types of transformation. This slightly amorphous residue includes:

(a) The agency of omnipresent, panchronic sound changes (Ascoli's "accidenti generali"), as against those specific sound shifts, limited in space and time, that are peculiar to individual languages at certain stages of their growth;

(b) Effects of analogy, whether due to (α) paradigmatic leveling or (β) lexical blend;

(c) Results of diffusion, conceivably caused by the fluidity of the speech community, some mixture of regional or social dialects (including "learned

words"), the migration of an isolated linguistic feature across its original borders, or the simultaneous spread of label and referent;

(d) Extraordinary situations: evasion of homonymy, observance of taboo, abnormal rate of attrition through formulaic use, crystallization of an "expressive" (e.g., reduplicative) form, and the like.

A scientifically elegant solution of the problem of space budgeting, I repeat, remains to be found. It has become customary to reserve a special chapter or subchapter for assimilation, dissimilation, metathesis, and kindred phenomena, invariably in closest vicinity to the basic sound shifts, though discreet relegation to a supplement, safe from any possible tangle with "drift", would, all told, represent a more advisable course.³⁰⁾ One may further argue that (b α), strictly

³⁰⁾ Among the familiar handbooks Menéndez Pidal's *Manual*, revised as of 1941, assigns to a separate, fairly long chapter on "Sporadic phonetic changes", wedged in between phonology proper and morphology, such obligatory topics as assimilation and dissimilation (including dissimilatory loss) of vowels and consonants, and simple beside reciprocal metathesis. To this irreducible core the author adds a motley assemblage of fringe phenomena: lexical blend, involving words allocated to a single series (= serialization as defined in *ArL*, IX, 106-113) and others, less exposed to group pressure; epenthesis, triply operative in antihatic consonant, nasal insert, attachment of -r to well-defined consonants and consonant clusters; folk etymology, hyperurbanism, and "acoustic equivalence" (for a critique of this term see *Lang.*, XXX, 142-146), i.e., certain forms of free variation. Why do antihatic consonants belong here, while buffer consonants, such as the intrusive stops in -mbr-, -ndr-, qualify for inclusion among regular consonant shifts?

Grandgent (1927), after preacquainting his readers with the "more or less erratic" doubling of consonants and the "occasional interchange" of *v* and *g*, subsumes under "Irregular changes" (§§ 134-148), the concluding link in a chain of phonological chapters, such miscellaneous items as "limitation" (= consonant assimilation at a distance), "diversification" (= dissimilation), "transfer" (= metathesis), "insertion", [hypocoristic] abbreviation (nursery language, nicknames). He apparently fails to distinguish sharply between (a) thwarted, arrested, or partially concluded sound shifts of the ordinary kind, and (b) sporadic changes quite unrelated to the general "drift".

Williams (1938) subordinates to the broad section on phonology two chapters, of which the first, "General phonological phenomena" (§§ 99-102), is concerned with assimilation, dissimilation, and vowel contraction in hiatus, also with metaphony, nasalization, and assibilation, while the second, slightly tinged by classicist terminology ("Sporadic changes", §§ 103-119), centers attention about [hypocoristic] abbreviation, analogy (gingerly defined as proportional relation, yet left undocumented), anaptyxis, aphesis, apocope, assimilation and dis-

speaking, belongs in the section on morphology, while the cases subsumed under (b β) are best examined atomistically, i.e., in an etymological dictionary. In practice, the compromise most frequently reached is to set off the "exception" from the "rule" by examining it at the end rather than at the start of a given paragraph, or by signaling the subordination in some self-explanatory typographic fashion (smaller print, downgrading to a footnote). ³¹) This lame arrangement, distracting one's attention from the relevant, may facilitate the casual consultation of a manual by textual critics and other semi-outsiders, but betrays the best interests of the linguist by failing to cast into bold relief the actual forces locked in constant struggle.

similation, confusion of prefixes and of initial syllables (or rather segments), contamination (including folk etymology and false regression), epenthesis (embracing, counter to Menéndez Pidal's practice, both antihhiatic and buffer consonants), metathesis, paragoge, prosthetic *a*, sandhi, false division. Again, one is prompted to question the wisdom of classing apocope (or, as in Portuguese, resistance to it) at such a remove from ordinary sound shifts; of meting out unequal treatment to prefixes and suffixes; of failing to group so common a process as the sonantization of surds with other "general phenomena".

In conclusion: Each author, in this secluded wing of his structure, seems to obey with greater freedom than elsewhere the dictates of his personal taste and occasionally even to indulge in gentle whims.

³¹) A few random examples of the current inadequacy. It is not uncommon to subdivide the affixes on the basis of transmission; the triadic arrangement "vernacular: learned: imported" appears embryonically in Darmesteter's treatise as early as 1877 and dominates Nyrop's standard-setting volume (1908). But, with regard to syntax, not even a scholar so alert to learned influence as was Lerch (consistently so on the monographic level) would exploit the possibility of such an opposition on a grand scale, though the indexes to the individual volumes of his diachronic *Französische Syntax* furnish a few clues. Again, even a phonology as artfully constructed as is Meyer-Lübke's (for French) abounds in allusions to strange side-lines, unexplained exceptions, conspicuous words of presumably ecclesiastic or non-indigenous parentage, suspected analogical departures (e.g., §§ 109, 114, 118, 122) – in short, all manner of qualifications and retractions which occasionally hedge in the main statements and slightly obscure the view. In handbooks prepared by the lesser luminaries of that school (Schultz-Gora, Wiese, Zauner, etc.) the exceptions are allowed to pile up disproportionately at every step. Similarly, in the analysis of inflection the constant interlocking of sound law and analogy has traditionally been recognized, but an attempt to compute separate balance sheets for the cumulative effects of each force would have appeared either impracticable or, worse, unorthodox, on the doctrinaire side.

3.5.6. *Selectivity*. It has always been the prerogative of beginners' guides to offer a mere selection of salient points, rather than an exhaustive treatment, of historical grammar, and authors (if they were at all explicit about such matters) have not, as a rule, been held strictly responsible either for methods used in setting up criteria of selection or for their skill in adhering to such criteria. In the second quarter of this century, however, there developed a new type of high-level study practising – sometimes unavowedly – a measure of discrimination, either by dealing overtly with select problems or by paying strikingly unequal attention to the ostensibly full array of problems included. The books here hinted at are neither loose collections of one scholar's articles assembled under a title which conceals a publisher's overstatement, such as Lerch's *Hauptprobleme*, nor learned testimonial volumes that serve as clearing-houses for *Prinzipienfragen*, but rather polished monographs conceived from the outset on the basis of a not fully explicated selection of features. The classic example of the genre is Menéndez Pidal's unsurpassed *Orígenes del español* (1926; 3d ed., 1950), a book of many appeals whose kernel – preceded by a masterly paleographic edition of some archaic texts, for the most part difficult of access, and followed by a broad historical synthesis, sparkingly phrased, – is a historical grammar, appearing at first glance almost complete. While this grammar outranks in freshness of design, precision of dating and localization, and volume and variety of documentation, the author's own earlier *Manual* (orig. ed., 1904) and *Cid* grammar (1908), it is, in important respects, less comprehensive and, above all, less evenly distributed than those not quite so personal contributions:

The writer deals in astonishing detail with chosen points (such as monophthongization of Lat. *ai* and *au* as against the diphthongization of *ě* and *ō*, the voicing of the surds, the shift of *r-* to *h-* and eventually to zero), while offering perceptibly sketchier surveys of other domains (e.g., the medial consonant clusters, the conjugation) and remaining embarrassingly reticent on certain points of, one should think, equal importance, such as the development of primary *-d-* (for a few, almost casual, hints see § 47.2, 5). The norm for including a shift and for the specific degree of detail assigned to its elucidation seems to be primarily its relevance to Menéndez Pidal's magnificently reconstructed historical panorama ("Regiones y épocas", §§ 86–106).

One is left wondering why certain traits fraught with dialectal implications, such as, I repeat, the varying preservation of *-d-* or the regionally conditioned distribution of the verb classes *-er* and *-ir* ³²) have been practically excluded, the upshot of the reader's uneasiness being his ever-present doubt: Would the underlying historical schema require drastic revision in the light of supplementary evidence?

The extreme of selectivity is represented by Wartburg's *Ausgliederung*, where relatively minor features, such as the evolution of *-ct-*, are magnified out of all proportion, and others, of capital importance, such as the continued distinction of *ũ õ, ỹ ě*, or the resistance of polysyllables to syncope in disconnected conservative territories, are almost neglected. True, this pamphlet no longer pretends to be a historical grammar, not even one in disguise.

In sober fact, both books represent valuable strings of miniature monographs integrated – the future will show whether or not prematurely – with significant slivers of non-linguistic archeological material.

3.5.7. The grouping by co-occurrence. Under special circumstances, particularly the demands of genetic classification, it is advisable to group the salient features of a language not on the strength of internal criteria, but on that of their reappearance in, or exclusion from, some other, usually neighboring, language(s) or dialect(s). What matters in such instances is no longer plain occurrence, but co-occurrence, whether due to mere coincidence or to (assumed) diffusion. Thus, Kuhn's monograph on Upper Aragonese breaks down all phonological changes observed (pp. 12–177) into three major types: (a) those displaying the familiar contrast between Castilian and general Ibero-Romance; (b) those traceable to a focal point in the northeast of the Peninsula or in some adjoining region, and (c) those lacking a specific focus, hence attributable to spontaneous polygenesis. Though Kuhn, regrettably, refrained from extending this technique to other disciplines, it does lend itself to application in allied domains, including lexicology (cf. the sifting-out of Visigothic words in Romance by E. Gamillscheg in *RFE*, XIX [1932], esp. 229–243).

³²) For details, see the concluding statement of my review of M. Gorosch's book in *Lang.*, XXXI (1955), 261–291, as well as the opening section of my article "Paradigmatic resistance to sound change" in the same journal, XXXVI (1960), 281–346.

3.5.8. *The graded approach.* For the convenience (properly or improperly interpreted) of university students there have arisen two didactic genres, as it were: all kinds of charts of sound correspondences, paradigmatic tables, and the like, apparently for quick reference or, worse, for memorization (Boyd-Bowman); and graded textbooks, primarily for the autodidact. The graded approach is, of course, common practice in the teaching of normative grammar, sometimes so stringently presented as to border on the truly descriptive. It ultimately underlies all elementary language instruction, and not a few textbooks of this kind, compiled by real experts, show a touch of genuine linguistic sophistication.³³⁾ In historical grammar this approach, already hinted at, has been infrequent, with Voretzsch (in the footsteps of the Anglist Zuspitza) and Gartner, in the initial piece (pp. 1-61) of his Rumanian omnibus volume (1904), ranking as the best-known specialists. Rohlf's *Vom Vulgärlatein zum Altfranzösischen*, whose title alone marks a concession to Anglo-American taste (otherwise the book embodies a trivial revision of Voretzsch's classic), represents the latest venture in this direction. The graded approach, often geared to the line-by-line interpretation of model texts, must by all means be distinguished from printed lecture courses, such as J.

³³⁾ Distinguished philologists and linguists have at all times been available for the writing of elementary grammars (and have usually done a more workmanlike job than literary scholars, however eminent in their field, cf. E. Faral's ill-fated grammar of Old French). A. Mussafia's guide to Italian had a considerable vogue in Central Europe; K. Nyrop's, to Spanish, proved a boon at least to Scandinavians; E. Herzog's and S. Pușcariu's, cut to the needs of German post-war learners of Rumanian, impresses one by its incisiveness and economy (while C. Tagliavini's parallel venture, vastly more erudite, shows traces of juvenile injudiciousness); F. Krüger's introduction to Modern Spanish fits into the cultural climate of *inter bella*; with an attractively light touch, F. Sommer prepared even a comparative grammar of "collegiate" languages, dead and living, for his native Germany, while L. Bloomfield had to his credit an elementary grammar of German, for American high-school or college students, as well as a more recent grammar of Dutch, for army use; he also had his share in a parallel war-time project for Russian. If an elementary practical grammar, under auspicious circumstances, may boast genuine scientific value, it is equally true that a "comparative" grammar, holding out greater promise, may be distressingly mediocre; O. W. Heatwole's, devoted to modern French, Spanish, and Italian, yet interspersed with historical "flashbacks", is, regrettably enough, a case in point.

Leite de Vasconcelos' on Portuguese and J. Wackernagel's on Indo-European syntax, designed to serve a select world-wide audience; from mimeographed lecture courses (a type of *aide-mémoire* lately very fashionable in France and in Italy) and textbooks recognizably based on them, such as Monteverdi's and even Tagliavini's, and from posthumously published lectures – an act of piety – e.g., C. Michaëlis's. All these tend to preserve the original climate of informality and a measure of redundancy, but are quite unlikely to arrange the material in the order of mounting difficulty.

3.5.9. Prospects of dynamic categories of classification. Though historical grammar, along with etymology, is the diachronic discipline par excellence, designed to cut across time rather than to survey a single temporal plane, it is nevertheless true that most of the classificatory categories ordinarily introduced: accentual conditions, configuration of the stressed syllable, the given sound's position vis-à-vis the word as a whole and vis-à-vis its immediate environment, and so forth (see the following Section), are strictly static, flowing in most instances from a descriptive analysis – however rudimentary – of the older stage. There are a few exceptions to this tendency, aside from those examined under 3.5.2: First, any attempt at periodization, even if the division, as sometimes happens, is made by intuition, presupposes a minimum or modicum of deliberate segmentation of the time axis; second, the occasional progression, in the biography of a single sound, from retention through modification to total loss (Meyer-Lübke), reckons with evolutionary stages; i.e., indirectly, with the passage of time. One may considerably refine this latter analysis by distinguishing between various degrees of deflection from the original state of balance and, once such a scale has been established, by making the measure of remoteness the prime classifier, even beyond the limits of phonology. This approach via latitude of departure could lead to systematic inventories, for certain languages, of absolute retention, comparatively high degree of retention, etc. and ultimately to a forceful analysis of extents of conservatism vs. innovation.

There comes to mind the untested possibility of yet another dynamic approach, this time one confined to phonology. Practitioners of historical grammar are agreed that not all sound shifts have taken effect with equal consistency; contrast the pervasive change of Lat. *A* to Fr. *e* in stressed, open syllable with, say, the sporadic, inconclusive

developments of syllable-final Lat. *l* in Spanish (*alto* vs. *ot-ero*). One finds no unanimity of opinion on the cause of such divergences: Some scholars think of different degrees of "blocking" by counterforces (e.g., analogical leveling, borrowing from adjacent dialects), while others operate with the bolder concept of sound laws inherently endowed with different measures of vitality, as a result of variable concomitants (interplay of sound pattern and "yield", the latter controlled by lexical frequency and frequency of actual occurrence). Whichever each expert's preference, one might, at least in theory, group all sound changes under consideration on the basis of (to use a controversial term) their relative degree of "regularity". Such an inventory, more than any other familiar arrangement of data, could lead to the detection of interferential and differentiating factor(s).

TACTICAL ARRANGEMENTS

4.0. Definition. Over against the major divisions of material which stamp each historical grammar with an immediately recognizable character one may place that multitude of minor tactical decisions for ordering data which become visible only upon closer inspection. The oldest arrangements of this kind were based on either crude externals (e.g., the alphabetical sequence of letters) or traditions taken for granted without critical examination (e.g., the systems of "parts of speech" inherited from Graeco-Latin grammar). The main evolutionary trend has been in the direction of increasing stress on the functionally significant. Not only did the pressure of the classical models gradually weaken, but even among the Romance languages scholars eventually learned not to take one as an obligatory model for the others.

Since diversification, from school to school and from author to author, at this point reaches its maximum, we can offer only a few stray illustrations suggestive of the actual latitude of possibilities.

4.1. The ordering of vowels. In Diez's original comparative phonology (1836) the analysis of vowels shows undeniable sophistication.

The specific and formal treatment of the Latin material (arranged in conventional succession: A, E, I, O, U, AE, OE, AU) is less noteworthy than some generalities relegated to an unobtrusive Supplement (pp. 164-175). In the formal section, Diez separates stressed from unstressed vowels, subdividing the latter into those so labeled *stricto sensu* (initial, medial, or final),

and those involving hiatus (primary, secondary, etc.). The Supplement reestablishes the cross-connections of which the reader may have lost sight in attending to details. Here the author posits such broad categories as quantity, contraction, metaphony, apophony, syncope, diphthongization (five genetic varieties), and, more important in retrospect, the inner configuration of the immanent vowel system (p. 166). He deals with the special status of proparoxytones, against the background of learned vs. vernacular transmission (p. 169), also briefly characterizes six concrete vowel systems (pp. 169-171), and in conclusion affords a cross-linguistic inventory of all diphthongs encountered (pp. 174-175). The revised edition (1870) compresses some passages of the Supplement, but expatiates, as if by compensation, on the influence of surrounding consonants (p. 196) and, without using these terms, points up contrasts between allegro and lento rhythm, the latter equated with poetic diction (p. 202).

Without exaggeration, all subsequent refinements, to the extent that they signaled genuine progress, aimed at a closer integration of Diez's inventory of specific facts and of his methodologic afterthoughts.

The possibilities for rearrangement were numerous, though not unlimited; the more complex the facts, the greater the potential diversification of classificatory schemas. Thus, French shows a more intricate development than Spanish, for three independent reasons. First, the number of intermediate stages between the stressed vowels of, say, *BOUE* and *bœuf*, or of *RÊGE* and *roi*, is higher than is observable or inferable in corresponding Latin-Spanish equations. Second, the configuration of the syllable exercises a controlling influence in the *langue d'oïl*, as against Spanish; this calls for a new category, checked vs. free syllable (contrast *mère* with *barbe*). Third, a following nasal consonant arrests the evolution of a vowel (*veine* vs. *roi*). The interplay of so many discrete factors opens up an unusual latitude of prospects, allowing the analyst either to examine each vowel separately, subdividing the different outcomes according to the changing concomitants, or else, in a more abstract vein, to distribute the entire material on the prime basis of the different representation of these forces (stress, nasality, contour of the syllable; also locale and evolutionary stage at issue).

An expert such as Suchier leaned toward emphasis on external criteria (1888), minimizing the importance (recognized by Diez) of initial, medial, and final position for unstressed vowels, but tightening his outline by rigorous territorial distinctions: Standard French (pp. 572-592) sharply separated from five regional varieties, or alliances

of varieties, of Gallo-Romance (pp. 592–605) and, within the former section, neat periodization: (a) before the 12th century, (b) during that century, (c) after that century, (d) present-day situation, in the manner here suggested in Section 1.2, and with occasional interposition of synchronic views. The resulting mixed perspective was later to develop much more fully (see Section 6.1.2, below).

The rash projection of categories from one language into another vitiates Cornu's otherwise elaborate treatment of Portuguese (1888, 1906). The author, whose contact with Old French grammar had made him hypersensitive to the distinctive evolution of certain vowels in free and checked syllables, examined each Portuguese vowel under these two heads, apparently unaware of the fact that in western Ibero-Romance the syllabic contour is consistently irrelevant.

Meyer-Lübke's treatment of vowels (1890) shows noteworthy innovations. The fundamental distinction between stressed and unstressed has been maintained, but the vowels are no longer paraded in alphabetic order. The basic comportment of each stressed vowel is examined under three headings: (a) preservation, (b) spontaneous change, (c) conditioned change; the last-mentioned invites further subdivision, through localization and narrower categorization of the conditioning factor: (α) the following sound (nasal, palatal, labial, velar consonant; the back semivowel; a consonant cluster) or (β) the preceding sound (similarly classified in articulatory terms). These subdivisions are so skillfully executed that the various non-contiguous sections on, say, "preservation" permit immediate confrontation.³⁴

The 20th century introduced few tactical innovations, though it brought several strategic maneuvers (and untold corrections of etymological details). Meyer-Lübke's oft-revised French grammar (orig.

³⁴) Even so, there remains a disquieting residue of exceptional arrangements. Under *i*, an unintegrated paragraph deals with conditions which prevail in oxytones, though neither the number of syllables nor the absolute position of the stress in given words are otherwise emphasized (§ 43); there further remains a dangling section (§ 44) on peculiarities unclassifiable within the chosen pattern, and a counterpart of this section later mars the discussion of $\bar{u}$ (§ 67). The neatness of the design is further jeopardized by an excursus on certain spontaneous developments of *ei* < $\bar{e}$ (§§ 71–78) and another on the sporadic transformations of $\bar{e}$ into [e] and [i] (§§ 115–116), both with exact parallels under $\bar{o}$ (§§ 120–126, 145–149). Additional complications arising from the slightly deviant treatment of $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{o}$ are redeemed by their perfect symmetry.

1908), famous for its pronounced chronological orientation (see Section 3.5.1, above), exhibits a discernibly more flexible organization than his earlier Romance grammar, a concession to new tastes making it a less handy reference tool but a more effective interpreter of unique historical trends.

The writer takes as his cornerstone the discovery of a formula, pervasive, though historically and territorially specific (§ 47: in proto-Northern French, only lengthened stressed vowels are subject to conspicuous change), and builds his edifice around this one broad observation, first removing stray obstacles (§§ 48–52) from the beautifully landscaped terrain, then arranging the pertinent shifts in the logically most cogent, i.e., historically most plausible, succession. Characteristic of his broadened vision is the deliberate rapprochement of cognate changes, which an indifferent cataloguer would tend to keep apart, such as the parallel contrasts between *chier*: *mer* and *cire*: *voire* (§ 63). Similarly, nasalization, recognized as a single broad tendency, is examined in a close-knit sequence of discussions (§§ 67–72). Nevertheless, there remain some loose ends, through sporadic, unintegrated references to learned words and borrowings (§ 66) and to dialectal developments (§ 79); quite apart from the fact that whole categories of words forcibly excluded from consideration are set aside in an introductory section (§§ 32–45).

Meyer-Lübke's experimental book remains within the bounds of a standard historical grammar, but contains the germs of radical deviations from tradition: From here one path leads to the array in which straight chronology overrides all other considerations, as in Richter's *Romanismen* (1934), another to almost exclusive concentration on traits uniquely characteristic of the chosen language, as in Menéndez Pidal's *Orígenes* (1926, 1950).

It would be otiose to review here the countless minor variations embodied in the various outlines of Romance phonology.³⁵⁾ Looking

³⁵⁾ A few random illustrations. Grandgent's rough classification (1927) is based on the character of the syllable (accented, "secondary tonic", unaccented, the last-mentioned with the expected subdivision); within each category the vowels of "Vulgar Latin" (i.e., proto-Italian) are individually reviewed in alphabetic order. The bulk of his material, which fails to fit into this straitjacket, the author presents, in small print, at the conclusion of each paragraph. While the remarks are for the most part neatly circumscribed, atomization reigns supreme, since no guiding principle is further perceptible at the lower echelons: one discovers a maze of lexical and onomastic problems, illustrations of analogical shifts, disquieting references to "puzzling words", "obscure associations",

to the future, one may argue: Major improvements, within the framework of the traditional genre, are achievable by overcoming several recurrent (not to say endemic) deficiencies:

(a) The structural grasp of concatenations may be introduced on a more liberal scale. The concept of the "empty box", applying particularly to French vocalism, allows one to set off a primary [u], at the Latin stage (with the usual cleavage into a long and a short variety); a secondary medieval [u], originally in free syllable, as in *-ous* < *-ōsu*; a tertiary modern [u], as in *court* < OFr. *cort* < *curtu*, uninterruptedly in checked syllable, an innovation facilitated by the shift of *-ous* to *-eux*, etc.;

(b) In dialect study, heightened concern with convergence must balance sustained attention to divergence;

(c) A formal system is needed for measuring the dimension of learned departure from the vernacular norm (approximations such as "semilearned" inopportunely suggesting a fixed half-and-half ratio, are inadequate); the next desideratum is a technique for building the results of such measurement into the general edifice of historical phonology, much as scholars have engineered a schema, or rather rival schemas, for highlighting rural dialectal idiosyncrasies;

(d) The unstressed vowels have been the phonologist's stepchildren (textual critics, to be sure, have excellent excuses for concentrating on assonances and rhymes; also, for some less obvious reason, Guerlin de Guer translated only that part of Gröber's treatise which dealt with stressed vowels). The conventional analysis of atonic vowels demands overhauling. It is customary to start out with the syllables carrying the primary and the secondary stress, irrespective of their position in the word, while the unstressed syllables are classed, in part, on the basis of their position relative to the stress (e.g., "intertonic"), in part, on the strength of their absolute

"peculiar developments"; examples of imitation of Provençal and French usage, of special dialectal developments, of contrasts between words poetic and colloquial (or learned and popular), and of separate norms for proclitics and enclitics; also, hints of apheresis, prefix change, and the like. Since the "exceptions", even if measured by so trivial a yardstick as the space allotted to them, far outweigh the rules and fall into no clear-cut pattern of their own, the reader despairs of recognizing in each actual form a compromise between a few independent forces, of which the phonological drift is only one.

Williams's chief improvements (1938) over his immediate model lie in providing multipronged rather than deceptively simple sound correspondences, in subordinating each of the dwindling number of exceptions to a particular, sharply delineated prong, in separating, even on the typographic level, plainly observable facts from explicative conjectures, however ingenious, and in altogether removing from the phonological field of observation purely lexical intricacies. As a result, his book is leaner, but tidier and tighter than Grandgent's.

position within the word (e.g., "word-initial", "word-final"). This arrangement leaves some loose ends: the importance of oxytonic stress for the French development of *A* (*dé-jà*), the contrast in the Old Spanish outcome of -E between paroxytones and proparoxytones: *fe(e)*, *lueñ(e)*, *mill*, *noch(e)*, *sol* beside *ánade* (a contrast leveled where medial consonant clusters, primary or secondary, are at work: *madre* matches *conde*, *ombre*, *verde*), and similar points, too important to be hidden away in footnotes. A cogent classificatory system devised consistently, without redundancy, to heed a given syllable's relative and absolute position could throw the evolution of vowels, especially those unstressed, into impressively bold relief.

4.2. The ordering of consonants. No other section of this survey presents so complicated a pattern of rival possibilities, latent or tested. This extra margin of complexity is due to the concurrence of several independent factors:

(a) the numerical superiority of consonants over vowels, at least in a typical Romance language, against the need for apportioning an equal share of attention to each phoneme;

(b) the tradition of identifying consonants by both locus and mode of articulation;

(c) the abundance, particularly in Spanish and in Old French, of consonant clusters, as compared with the relative paucity of straight vowel sequences and of diphthongs combined;

(d) the virtually obligatory inclusion of phonology in any historical grammar, vs. the optional status of disciplines equally intricate, such as derivation and syntax;

(e) the almost mandatory attention, in phonology, to discrepant dialectal conditions (seldom, if ever, taken into account by syntacticians).

Though some characteristic classifications will figure here in chronological succession, such sequence implies no intention to trace the evolution of the schema. The task at hand is rather to contrast, for the sake of their clashing configurations, a few basic arrays whose authors, with the sole exception of Diez, had before them ingenious models which they were at liberty to adopt, to modify, or to reject.

Diez's method shows astonishing adroitness for its early date (1836).

From the outset, he distinguishes between locus and mode of articulation, elevating the former above the latter, so that all labials are presented jointly, in this sequence: *P*, *B*, *F*, *V*, *M*. Each Latin consonant phoneme constitutes a unit, and all its outcomes are ideally included in a single section (I mention below, in fn. 37, some compromises with common sense and economy). The further splitting of such a unit fundamentally reflects its position within the word and vis-à-vis its neighbors, the standard

sequence being: word-initial, intervocalic, word-final; lengthened (geminate); constituting the first or the second ingredient of a bipartite consonant cluster, so that P-, -P-, -P, -PP- precede PT-, PS-, PN-, -PT- and -PD-, -PS- and -PS, while these lead to SP. (This arrangement entails the difficulty of requiring the discussion of each dyadic cluster in two disconnected passages). Significantly, the individual results in each language represent the smallest classificatory unit, a tribute to Diez's superb grasp of Romance linguistics as a whole. This bold cross-linguistic perspective dominates, e.g., the analysis of -B- (pp. 180-182): the writer first breaks down the results into four basic possibilities: (a) change to -v-, (b) maintenance of -b-, (c) transformation into another labial, (d) loss, ³⁶) and only then adduces specific illustrations. ³⁷)

By the late 19th century, numerous other classifications, not always marked by improvement over Diez's, became available. Suchier's prime division (1888), for French and Provençal, was not into broad categories of sound (vowels vs. consonants) nor into large geographic chunks, but into chronological layers. In his weightiest chapter, examining such changes as antedated the 12th century, he singled out (§ 11) those common to both languages (PI = $j = G^{e,1}$, prosthetic $e-$, etc.), unfortunately remaining undecided as to whether the wider

³⁶) At this point a modern worker would have inverted the sequence of (a) and (b), so as to allow for a gradual rise from preservation through transformation to total disappearance. After subsuming the new (b) and (c) under a common denominator, one arrives – granted the correctness of Diez's raw facts – at the following, less coarse-grained scheme: (a) preservation; (b) change into a labial ($\alpha: v$; β : some other labial); (c) loss.

³⁷) The succession of divisions is not rigid, allowing occasional reversal for the sake of increased economy or effectiveness. Thus, where the outcomes are similar for initial and medial position, as with $F > h$ and $v > b$ or $g(u)$, or for all three positions, as is true of $m > n$, Diez subordinates the (uncharacteristic) position to the (characteristic) development; where a given cluster is genetically restricted to a single lexical strain, as in typically Hellenic PT-, PS-, PN-, he introduces a parenthetic reference, strictly speaking irrelevant, to this strain; where striking convergence is at once apparent, as with CL-, FL-, PL-, he jointly discusses these shifts, with all requisite cross-references, in splendid anticipation of modern trends. The attention to word-stress is kept at a minimum, all channels of transmission are relegated to the background, and the profound difference between the comportment of primary and secondary clusters, though clearly apprehended in the case of MN ("ursprünglich" vs. "[durch] Ausfall eines Vokals"), remains hazy in the total design.

regional spread implied temporal priority.³⁸⁾ The following paragraph, arranged and phrased with equal cursoriness, he reserved for consonantal changes showing Old French opposed to Old Provençal (e.g., -TR-, -DR-; K^a-).

Baist's analysis of Spanish, also dating from 1888, passes in review, first, simple consonant phonemes and, later, corresponding clusters, each examined from several angles (the exact procedure is nowhere clarified). It differs from Diez's in that the mode of articulation occupies a higher rank than the locus, so that P, T, and C (i.e., K) jointly precede B (V), D, and G, while M and N, like R and L, are grouped together as sonants. Despite Baist's noted philological prowess and special concern with thorny etymologies, his treatment suffers from serious weaknesses. One drawback is his inability to recognize unifying tendencies behind the myriads of colorful details (even § 38 is a mere tabulation of major shifts); another, of a more technical order, is his failure to draw the all-important distinction between primary and secondary clusters (an idiosyncrasy which, e.g., utterly distorts § 50).

Meyer-Lübke's grand classification of Romance consonant shifts (1890) represents the sharpest conceivable break with all earlier practice and, simultaneously, marks one of the all-time summits of linguistic craftsmanship. If Diez's basic operational unit was the single phoneme, however deftly placed in its proper niche, Meyer-Lübke's far more "algebraic" division rested squarely on positions abstractly defined. The three main divisions in the new schema (A, B, C) involved the position of the consonant within the word: initial (§§ 404-431), medial (§§ 432-548), or final (§§ 549-569), followed by an anticlimactic fourth (§§ 570-591), which amounted to little more than an appended catalogue of "accidenti generali" (somewhat lamely labeled "Lautvertauschungen"); since this Supplement, judged by modern standards, only obstructs the free flow of genuine phonology, it will advisedly be disregarded.

The long section on consonants in medial position stimulated the author's climb to the highest peak of sophistication. Starting with the dual premise

³⁸⁾ "... diejenigen, die sich über ganz Gallien und darüber hinaus erstreckt haben, womit freilich nicht gesagt sein soll, daß die Veränderungen, welche nur einen Teil des galloromanischen Gebietes umfaßt haben, zu einer späteren Zeit eingetreten sein müßten". For subsequent periods Suchier took into account French alone, except in a string of special chapters on dialect speech (§§ 26-39).

(§ 432) that the dominant factors here were the consonant's position vis-à-vis the stressed vowel (a circumstance practically irrelevant as regards initials; here most influential with respect to stops) and its occurrence in fixed syllabic-accentual types (paroxytones, etc.), Meyer-Lübke propounded the following schema for his next division (I, II, III, IV): "Simple consonants in paroxytones" (§§ 433-457), "Consonant groups in paroxytones" (§§ 458-522), "Consonants in proparoxytones" (§§ 523-540), and "Geminat consonants" (§§ 541-548); that is to say, at this classificatory rung the syllabic-accentual structure of the word and the degree of "simplicity" of the consonant phoneme were granted equal consideration. Not all the groups thus sifted out were further subdivided with comparable elaborateness; Group I lent itself to the most cogent analysis. The next step was subdivision in terms of mode of articulation (a, b) opposing stops and spirants (§§ 433-447) to sonants, i.e., to N, M, R, L (§§ 448-457). Before itemizing the members of these small groups, Meyer-Lübke drew another dividing line, at least, through the first, contrasting the posttonic (§§ 433-442) with the pretonic position (§§ 443-447), at a time when Verner's law was in the focus of interest. Even at this stage the individual facts were not yet allowed to come to the fore. The posttonic group fell implicitly into three subgroups: voiceless stops (§§ 433-435), voiced stops (§§ 436-439), and spirants (§§ 440-442), and the pretonic into just two subgroups: stops (§ 443) and spirants (§§ 444-447).

In dramatic contrast, then, to Diez, Meyer-Lübke leads his reader to the specific consonant phoneme as the smallest unit, or one of the smallest, of his construct, and he sides with Baist rather than with Diez in his choice of mode rather than locus of articulation for any classificatory purpose, explicit or implied (§ 405), while periodization is deemphasized throughout. Only at the lowest hierarchic level do some timid resemblances to Diez appear; cf. the studiously subordinate importance accorded to individual "daughter languages".

Thus, in discussing word-initial [g] or [j] before front vowel (§ 407), Meyer-Lübke first establishes a chain of four evolutionary stages, of which the third presupposes the second: (α) preservation of the V.-Lat. state, (β) shift to the voiced affricate [ǧ], (γ) de-affrication to [ž], (δ) complete loss, and finally illustrates each possibility that has materialized with examples from one or several languages. Similarly, unconditional change of [l-] to [λ]- (§ 418) paves the way for all kinds of conditional fronting of the lateral, which the author characteristically tags as "sekundäre Palatalisierung" (§§ 419-420: before front vowel in Rumanian and in Raeto-Romance; §§ 421-425: in the cognate groups CL-, GL-, PL-, BL-, FL-, examined in a progression from language to language).

In other words, the lower rungs of Meyer-Lübke's ladder are formed, somewhat haphazardly, by (a) concrete sound units of the parent language (consonant phonemes), (b) territorial units or specific linguistic systems of the "daughter generation", (c) evolutionary stages, whose range stretches from extreme conservatism to maximum departure from the assumed starting point.

The artfulness of Meyer-Lübke's approach shines forth in numerous details. Since the broad view is consistently in the direction of the daughter languages, from the immovable vantage point of the ancestral tongue, only primary consonant clusters in medial position qualify for representing a formal subdivision; the all-important secondary clusters, however, are somewhat surreptitiously brought in under proparoxytones (§§ 525-538). Despite many such felicities, the treatise, measured by present-day standards of rigor and explicitness, shows serious architectural flaws.

Thus, the consonant clusters in paroxytones are discussed in impressive detail, but one misses a preliminary guide to their classification and is left wondering why some binary groups are defined by the mere point of articulation of both ingredients (e.g., "labial plus dental", § 458), others by specific mention of only the first phoneme (e.g., combinations with *s*-, §§ 468-473, and with *r*-, §§ 474-475), yet others by equally specific identification of the concluding phoneme alone (e.g., consonants preceding *l* and *r*, §§ 487-495, and, of course, those preceding [w] and [j], §§ 501-522), while one restricted group of shifts is incongruously tagged not at all by any static characteristics of the elements, or of one element, involved, but by a dynamic trait: the stubborn resistance to erosion shown, counter to expectation, by the second element (§§ 496-500).

Meyer-Lübke's grandiose synthesis, then, marked a decisive step toward increased abstractness, but left ample room, if not for further tightening, at least for more rational apportionment.³⁹⁾

³⁹⁾ Minor organizational flaws in the *Lautlehre* are quite numerous. The Table of Contents was hastily prepared; so were the headings for some sections. Thus, § 426 (on labialization: qu-), § 427 (on voicing of initial consonants), §§ 428-430 (on loss or addition of initial consonants), § 431 (on secondary initial clusters) inexplicably all appear subordinated to the section on secondary palatalization. Admittedly, lexical detail still obstructs the view (§ 427: "Es handelt sich dabei nicht um eine bestimmte Regel, sondern jedesmal um besondere Einflüsse, es ist daher jeder einzelne Fall für sich zu betrachten"). The division of final consonants into primary (§§ 549-553) and secondary (§§ 554-569) breaks the basic design. The phrasing of some sections is weak (§§ 450-454: -N-);

From the high-water mark of sophistication in formal array (1890) which Meyer-Lübke's position, despite vestigial flaws, undoubtedly signaled, there was only a succession of retreats and compromises throughout the following decades – to the extent that this kind of diachronic arrangement of consonants further occupied the focus of attention. A dubious excuse for this spell of fatigue or surfeit is the fact that for casual reference and for elementary didactic purposes, the degree of abstractness aimed at proved disquietingly high. In an effort to grapple with the concrete, isolated facts of language growth on a lower plane of analysis, as it were, some authors reverted to Diez's starting point (1836), presenting jointly or in close succession all outcomes of a given consonant. Typical of this attitude are Nunes' *Fonética histórica* (1895) – slightly more advanced in its treatment of vowels – and, above all, Bourciez's *Précis* which, as a result of its immense circulation, must have been instrumental in dulling its many young readers' acumen and imagination (the three introductory chapters on generalities offer scant compensation for such dry cataloguing of facts). The alternative for a textbook writer (and historical grammar at that stage tended to degenerate into a textbook industry) was to accept only part of the newly suggested hierarchization, e.g., the gross separation into initial, medial, and final position. This possibility was grasped by Ford in the introductory prospectus to his *Old Spanish readings* (somewhat incongruously, he set up a fourth group for medial clusters and, within each group, proceeded – roughly and inexplicitly – from straight retention through modification to loss); throughout the grammatical sketch included in Crescini's tripartite *Manuale*, conservatism was enhanced by the supremacy accorded, as in Diez, to the point over the mode of articulation. Only in a single respect did the simplification of Meyer-Lübke's convolute schema harmonize with actual progress of knowledge: Younger scholars inclined to assess the importance of word-stress for consonant development more cautiously than was the order of the day two generations ago; even downright denials of its rôle were no longer uncommon.⁴⁰⁾

stray references to the socio-educational dimension were built in haphazardly (§ 540); the French contrast pretonic : posttonic proparoxytones was introduced at too low a hierarchical level.

⁴⁰⁾ Remember that in his French grammar (1908) – at the midway point of his career – Meyer-Lübke resolutely swerved from this self-imposed line in

4.3. Other domains. In inflection, it is as common to see declension placed ahead of conjugation – for no more valid reason than convention – as it is in phonology to find the vowels preceding the consonants.⁴¹ Possibly the most exciting cleavage that one observes in accounts of Romance inflection is between those grammars which, in plodding fashion, include all “particles” (prepositions, interjections, etc.), and others which take the definition of “inflection” quite literally, limiting its territory to declension, conjugation, and, at most, grading and the formation of adjectival adverbs. The former trend is exemplified – among countless conservatives – by P. Förster (1880) and A. Keller (1894); the latter, by Darmesteter’s posthumous *Traité de la formation de la langue française* and, more recently, by Šišmarëv’s *Morphology*. (In contributions, including Baist’s and Cornu’s, to Gröber’s *Grundriß*, this restraint may have been imposed by scarceness of space rather than by doctrinaire considerations.) The barest minimum of the pre-structuralist morphology is the paradigmatic table, cf. the “Abriß” prefacing Appel’s *Chrestomathie*. By consolidating syntax and inflection, a writer automatically eliminates the problem of the invariable particles: Thus, the unified section “Formes et syntaxe” (pp. 241–698) in Brunot-Bruneau’s *Précis* treats on a par verbs, nouns, interjections, and negative “mots-outils”.⁴²

favor of a near-chronological arrangement (see Section 3.5.1, above). His old-age monographs, such as *Die Schicksale des lateinischen L im Romanischen* (1934), afford a glimpse of how, strength permitting, the author might have organized a new phonology half a century later. The only formal subdivision is into *l-*, *-l’-*, *-ll-*, *C + l* [mostly word-initial], and *l + C* [mostly word-medial]; no signposts mark further subdivisions, but Chap. I, not uncharacteristically, leads the reader from preservation of *l-* via transformations into [ð] and [ð-] > [w-] (Calabria), into [d] (North Italian colonies in Sicily), into [λ-] beside [λ-] > [j-] (Catalonia and Leon) to sporadic total loss as the logical concluding point.

⁴¹ By way of exception, in several sections of Bourciez’s *Éléments* the verb precedes the noun.

⁴² Concerning the arrangement of chapters on Romance derivation and composition one finds many useful bits of information in Chap. I (“The theory of Romance word formation”) of P. M. Lloyd’s unpublished doctoral dissertation (California at Berkeley, 1960), *A linguistic analysis of Old Spanish occupational terms* (pp. 15–76 and 161–173 of the typescript).

Syntax has likewise been disregarded, for a variety of reasons. Relatively few all-purpose historical grammars grant it adequate space (two such exceptions are García de Diego’s [1951] and Hanssen’s [1910, 1913] manuals of

PRESENTATION

5.0. Delimitation. In a book-length typological essay the presentation of historical grammar, to the extent that it involves certain minor preferences, the inclusion of several features of subordinate importance, and miscellaneous peculiarities relevant to the history of each project, to book trade, and to cataloguing techniques, would require special consideration. All such peripheral matters can receive here only the barest passing mention.

5.1. Levels of style. As regards sharply pronounced style, one finds the expected spectrum of possibilities, ranging from terseness bordering on the cryptic (Meyer-Lübke), to smoothness (Meillet), elegance (Benveniste), discursiveness, and even garrulity (Spitzer). Some scholars favor a long succession of brief paragraphs, an arrangement giving their grammars the appearance of a check-list (Deferrari); others emphasize the essentials and subordinate the details; a minority dispense completely with "iron-clad" paragraphing.

5.2. Volume of documentation. With respect to illustration, some grammars are known for an excessive accumulation of examples, making their perusal uncomfortable (Cornu); this flaw may stem from a long-prevalent confusion of manual and reference work, a blemish from which even Mayer-Lübke's splendid *Einführung* cannot be pronounced entirely free. Other grammarians are renowned for their judicious restraint from such overindulgence (Williams). The documentation ordinarily cites bare forms, preceded by a brief qualifier marking period and dialect and sometimes followed by a succinct parenthetical identification of the source (e.g., medieval text or atlas map); that is, the availability of a standard dictionary offering further clues is taken for granted. But there is no dearth of exceptions: Ascoli's monographs, for instance, and Menéndez Pidal's *Orígenes* – as against his more

Spanish). Among those which do, some split it up according to the dictates of morphology; thus, Ewert's *French language* (1933) examines syntax intermittently under infinitive, present participle, and gerund (pp. 183–186), imperative (pp. 203–204), past participle (pp. 229–231), and so forth. Also, probably the majority of short and even middle-sized compendia are satisfied with desultory comments, appositely titled "Notes de syntaxe" (Darmesteter's posthumous *Traité*) or "Syntaktisches" (Gartner's *Darstellung*, Wiese's *Elementarbuch* [1904, 1928], Kuhn's *Dex hocharagonesische Dialekt* [1935], and many others); cf. also L. Jordan's "Ausgewählte Abschnitte der Satzlehre". Cf. p. 340.

conventional *Manual* – are replete with facts either newly unearthed or hitherto not readily accessible.

5.3. Special typographic devices. Some books resort to all sorts of devices helpful to the beginner (tables, boxes, charts, diagrams, arrows, etc.); others provide emphasis through striking fonts (Meyer-Lübke guides the reader of his French grammar by the use of bold-face, even in the middle of a sentence); yet others contrast base and product by small capitals and italics respectively; Rheinfelder uses German type for glosses, etc.

5.4. Optional features. A wealth of optional features provide further variation. These include maps (as early as Fuchs, 1849, and Ascoli, 1873), all sorts of figures, charts, and tables (e.g., to illustrate sound production), miscellaneously arranged bibliographies (alphabetic or, as in the case of Gartner's *Handbuch*, chronological), tables of contents (*tables analytiques*), and word-indexes (some of them, e.g., Alessio's [1955], Behrens's, Brunot's [1922, 1935], and Elcock's [1960], by dint of their elaborate subdivision represent miniature masterpieces in their own right), ⁴³⁾ synopses (note the two appended to Vol. I of Meyer-Lübke's French grammar), isolable etymological problems (in Vol. I, 563–564 of his Romance grammar, the same scholar offered a roster of advocates of the various solutions; Lerch's *Hauptprobleme*,

⁴³⁾ The variety of indexes, and of techniques used in compiling them, is such as to justify a separate typological study. Some authors merge the Indices Rerum, Verborum, Nominum; others keep them apart. In the Index Verborum one finds up to thirty subdivisions on the basis of language; authors favoring a single alphabetic sequence have recourse to abbreviated qualifiers. As early as 1873, Ascoli set off Latin etyma by spacing (*Sperrdruck*); Baldinger (1950) reserved italics for such dialect forms as lack counterparts in the standard. Aside from words, scholars index prefixes and derivational (rarely also inflectional) suffixes, cf. Alessio (1955), pp. 496–513; toponyms and tribal names (id., 1946, pp. 211–213); "Flurnamen", i.e., microtoponyms (Kuhn, 1935); matters of potential ethnographic interest (my only example is from Bloomfield's *Eastern Ojibwa*, a descriptive monograph); meanings (*UCPL*, Vol. XI) and identificational terms (Bally, *Traité de stylistique*), etc. The older indexes (e.g., Cohn's) aimed frequently at selective, rather than exhaustive, listing. On account of the drudgery involved, the indexes have sometimes been prepared by persons other than the authors; F. Apfelstedt and E. Seelman took care for the "Register" to the last, posthumous ed. (1882) of Diez's grammar, while Giuseppina Da Re and Clara Messi compiled the long "Wörterverzeichnisse" (pp. 299–341) to Wagner's Sardinian phonology.

syntactically oriented, also contains an Index Nominum, not to be confused with a glossary of proper names, i.e., anthroponyms and toponyms, such as offered by Darmesteter as early as 1874, also by Appel and Alessio [1946]), Addenda and Corrigenda (in Schuchardt's *Vokalismus* these, together with the Index, form a separate volume), prefatory notes by the authors and supporting prefaces by their sponsors or executors (note É. Littré's to Brachet's French grammar, and Meillet's to Ernout's Latin morphology), lists of abbreviations, keys to transcription, glossaries of technical terms (Bourciez in his *Précis* and Deferrari), Supplements (Gartner's Raeto-Romanian grammar [1883] includes a separately paged "Nachtrag" to his *Gredner's Mundart* [Linz, 1879]; Holmes and Schutz fill a quarter of the total space with extracts from Vaugelas's *Remarques* [1647] and from a governmental "Arrêté" [1900]), and the like.

A peculiarity of the earlier American product (Holmes-Schutz, Pei), almost invariably frowned upon by Continental reviewers, was the inclusion of exercises; so also (in England) D. Paton's *Manuel d'ancien français*. The current vogue of general and descriptive grammars in this country gives a writer – or rather a publisher – intent on providing drill the option between the preparation of a separate "work book" (H. A. Gleason, Jr., 1955) and the marginal inclusion, in the textbook itself, of practice material (C. F. Hockett, 1958). Conceivably, the beginner's historical grammar of the future will likewise be accompanied by some kind of work book. On the European book market, dominated by Germany, practice exercises and diachronic projection are found side by side only in a modern layman's grammar ("Konversationsgrammatik") or a school grammar impregnated, to the point of obtrusiveness, with historical reminiscences, such as Tagliavini's for Rumanian. Because such hybrid grammars and others, candidly practical, cater to the autodidact, they are often supplemented by a "Key", which may also contain a bidirectional vocabulary (as is true of Tagliavini's textbook). Vol. II of Bally's *Traité de stylistique* stands apart.

5.5. Publication data. One final sheaf of relevant details is provided by the book's status in the publishing world. Is it an original or a translation? (Brachet, Morel-Fatio, and G. Paris teamed up to translate Diez's grammar, while Hanssen, in 1913, simultaneously revised, amplified, and himself translated his earlier handbook). Does the new

venture amount to an abridgment, as is true of J. Haas's *Abriß* and of Bàrtoli and Braun's adaptation of Meyer-Lübke's book-length Italian grammar, or to a recasting by a fellow scholar (cf. E. Schwan and D. Behrens, K. Voretzsch and G. Rohlfs)? Is there close imitation of a model, as when F. B. Luquiens avowedly followed Schwan-Behrens's pattern? Is the monograph classifiable as a mere fragment, as is true of Ascoli's "Schizzi"? Has the text, left incomplete at the author's death, been brought to a formal conclusion by some obliging fellow worker(s) – an emergency which arose, and was met with varying success, in the case of A. Darmesteter (L. Sudre and A. Thomas) and P. Savj-Lopez (P. E. Guarnerio)? Assuming that two scholars collaborated from the start, were they tempted to draw some dividing line between their respective shares and, if the answer is yes, was this line meant to separate chronological layers (U. T. Holmes, Jr. vs. A. H. Schutz) or neighboring disciplines (M. Leumann and J. B. Hofmann's joint revision of the Stolz-Schmalz Latin grammar)?

RELATION TO OTHER GENRES OF LINGUISTIC INQUIRY

6.0. Definition of the problem. No matter how neatly a theorist succeeds in circumscribing, by elimination, the domain of historical grammar, this domain, in actual practice, is not hermetically closed. Aside from being sometimes confused with other genres, only superficially related, it overlaps with a few to which it is actually akin, to the extent that a worker in search of some specific bit of information must often consult these allied writings which, on theoretical grounds, one is inclined to separate from historical grammar. These sporadic contacts, at the periphery of our typological survey, deserve only a few brief comments.

6.1. Relation to synchronic inquiries. Though no linguistic dichotomy is more familiar than that which assigns synchronism and diachronism to two different axes, the connection between them involves more than just occasional points of intersection. In some instances, the overlap, dictated by practical considerations, is of a casual nature; in others, it rests on deeper theoretical insights.

6.1.1. Casual references to synchronism. In historical grammars serving primarily as introductory textbooks (a solid majority, we recall, in the Romance field), authors have often deemed expedient to include

a plainly worded phonetic sketch, with more or less specific references to the language at issue; this sketch necessarily moves on a descriptive plane. Thus, the earlier editions of Menéndez Pidal's *Manual* were consistently diachronic; however, soon after the appearance (1918) of T. Navarro's descriptive *Manual de pronunciación* there was added to the successive revisions of his master's historical grammar a lengthy section on articulatory phonetics inevitably phrased in non-historical terms (§§ 5, 32-33). No such expanded cross-reference to fruits of laboratory research was necessary in the *Origenes*, a monograph addressed to thoroughly sophisticated readers, steeped in the study of history. Similarly, Bourciez's *Précis* contains a section on some "notions of general phonetics" (while his *Éléments* familiarizes the reader instead with the gist of "linguistic analysis" and with the essentials of "language growth"), and Nunes's *Compêndio* affords old-fashioned guidance to "physiological phonetics".

Instead of the final outcome a scholar may choose the inchoative stage of a given development for a bird's-eye view of synchronic structure. Historical grammars cut to Romance needs, from Schwann through Zauner's comparative manual to Williams, frequently contain an introductory chapter on Vulgar Latin, a reconstructed or fragmentarily recorded entity taken as the actual starting point for the journey through time. Such chapters tend to show a perspective chronologically "flattened" and regionally leveled; similar disregard of time depth with respect to the hypothetical parent language permeates the reconstructions of pioneer Indo-Europeanists.

6.1.2. The "growth-and-structure" (or "staircase") projection. Of discernibly greater merit is the systematic projection of language change through skillful alternate use of diachronic and synchronic analyses. Here synchronism is no mere adjunct, but forms an integral part of the design, based on the premise that no change in details, however conspicuous, lends itself to meaningful explanation except through reference to changes as between systems. Though such dramatic shifts of perspective, on a modest scale, were not unknown to the late 19th century (witness Suchier's contribution to the original *Grundriß*, 1888), the vogue of the genre and its explicit vindication and recognition coincide with the first half, or, to be precise, third, of the 20th. An apposite label, giving credit to Jespersen for his leadership, would be "growth-and-structure" projection; as a graphic alternative, coined

in a lighter vein, one may propose "staircase" perspective. A firm theoretical foundation for the approach and an adequate technique (e.g., for establishing an unassailable pattern of periodization) remain to be provided. The most elusive among its chief problems is this: Should the synchronic cuts mark periods of relative stability (balance, lull), separated by spells of turmoil (groping, insecurity), i.e., of quickened development; or should they set off stages at which, with the means at the analyst's disposal, a coherent description can be most smoothly provided? In other words: Does an actual state of temporary repose in the object studied invite specific adjustments in the angle from which the linguist aims his camera lens at that object? In unadulterated form, Jespersen's schema, supported by Meillet's authoritative experiments (*Aperçu, Esquisse*), was tried out on Romance ground by Wartburg (*Évolution et structure*). But the new idea also influenced indirectly several "language histories", perhaps most visibly Lapesa's (see Section 6.2.3, below); for Rumanian, cf. G. Nandriș.

6.2. Relation to language history. Under "language history", sometimes qualified "external", one understands either, in a narrow sense, the thread of major and minor historical events causally interwoven with the development of a given language (e.g., the dates for the foundation of academies, influential university chairs, and learned societies, for the promulgation of laws affecting language instruction, for the publication of tone-setting books such as certain normative dictionaries, prescriptive grammars, and widely imitated translations), an approach admirably exemplified by Brunot's "Sommaire chronologique...", left unchanged even in Bruneau's sweeping revision of his teacher's *Précis*; or, in a broader sense, the general historical matrix within which any specific development of a spoken or a written language can be significantly embedded, cf. the "Histoire et formation de la langue française" (pp. 12-86) preceding the kernel of Brachet's grammar (1867) and Leite de Vasconcelos' circumstantial account of Miranda and its environs (I, 3-165). Whichever way one cares to define it, language history, not least by virtue of its discursive presentation, seems distinctly closer to both general history and other specialized histories (e.g., those of law, literature, science, fine arts, etc.) than are historical linguistics, as a whole, and, in particular, diachronic grammar as its hard core. The latter, because of its high degree of formalization, invites an expository style reminiscent of the for-

mulaic arrangements of logic and mathematics. That is why language history, as the looser of the two analyses, has traditionally had vastly greater appeal for cultured laymen of undifferentiated tastes, for weakly motivated language-and-literature students, and for esthetically hypersensitive humanists than has unsentimental historical grammar hostile to all manner of vagueness and to merely verbal virtuosity. This peculiar relationship has led to multiple interlocking between the two disciplines.

A transitional form, differing from an orthodox grammar solely by the inclusion of a brief external history, a section on the lexicon, and, conceivably, a few appended sample texts, represents a "near-grammar"; fitting examples are Ewert's *The French language* and Darmesteter's posthumous *Traité* which, through a noteworthy piquancy, contrasts with the same scholar's voluminous formal course in French historical grammar.

6.2.1. Background information in formal grammars. Semi-naïve curiosity about certain historical facts surrounding language – in particular, about the infiltration of exotic lexical strains indicative of ethnic contacts – arose at an early date and was partially satisfied in a country like Spain by such Renaissance scholars as B. Aldrete and later, long before the advent of organized linguistics, by G. Mayáns y Siscar. From these and other pioneers, on whom he leaned heavily, Diez doubtless adopted the idea of a separate, lexically slanted section on the general historical background, at the start of his comparative grammar. The intrinsic autonomy of this preliminary sketch is eloquently demonstrated by the fact that the revised text heralding the 2d ed. (1856) of the Phonology: "Bestandteile und Gebiete der romanischen Sprachen" (I, 3–132), appeared in G. Paris's translation (1863) as an independent booklet. That same year also saw the publication of an English pamphlet embodying a parallel translation of this section alone. ⁴⁴⁾

⁴⁴⁾ Such introductory material was sometimes extended to include a brief statement on the primary sources of information (which only Gröber's "Einführung" examined in adequate detail, for their own sake) and to review the earlier analyses ("l'historique du problème"), the alternative being to relegate this critical recapitulation to a Supplement, as did Brachet in his *Dictionnaire des doublets*.

This tradition, a harmless concession to the average reader's essentially non-linguistic curiosity, hardened with the passage of time. By 1866 so versatile an explorer as Schuchardt retained the distinction between, to use his own terms, an external and an internal history of the Roman vernacular (*Vokalismus*, I, 44-75 and 76-166). Coelho (1871) carried Diez's tradition into the Iberian peninsula. A succinct preliminary survey (§§ 3-8) of tell-tale features of the lexicon marks not only the original (1888) but, more noteworthy, also the revision (1906) of Baist's Spanish grammar; independently it left stray vestiges in Múgica's introduction to his muddled grammar of Old Spanish (1891). By 1900, a widely observed rule linked at least the introductory chapter of a full-fledged historical grammar to some relevant survey of "historical conditions" (Bourciez, *Éléments*: characteristically, in small print); cf. Grandgent (1905), Zauner (1908), Huber (1933), and Williams (1938), four experts here chosen almost at random. M. K. Pope's detailed "External history" of French stands apart: it fills almost as many highly concentrated pages (1-48) as does Meyer-Lübke's Introduction to his multi-volume magnum opus.

6.2.2. Relation to the history of settlements and migrations. This branch of learning ("Siedlungsgeschichte") has at all times been heavily indebted to toponymy; before long, there were established additional bridges to lexicology. The idea of connecting chosen features of historical grammar (almost exclusively phonological traits) with elements of political history stems from a liberal assessment of the agency of protracted bilingualism. Certain contacts activated or strengthened by this agency are dubbed substratum, adstratum, and superstratum influences, depending on one's - frequently arbitrary - choice of the main layer. There has been in the past no lack of enthusiasts eager to ascribe every possible feature of lexicon and even of grammar to a favored ethno-linguistic stock; substratum studies have acquired a reputation as potential storehouses of manias and phobias. Balanced scholars, avoiding such extremes, have attributed only single features or close-knit sets of such features to specific ethnic or social ingredients of the total population. Ironically, as a consequence of this restraint, they have seldom paused to integrate such individual findings with the currently preponderant view of language as a tightly coherent system, in which every change of relevant detail is likely to provoke a chain reaction of potentially significant repercussions. The weakness

of this method, then, is patently rooted in its very selectivity (see Section 3.5.6, above); once that much has been granted, the abundance of factual information which this historical orientation, abetted by dialect geography, has poured forth deserves unstinting recognition. Classic examples of meticulous reconstruction of "isoglosses on the move" include Menéndez Pidal's successful revindication of the "F- > h- > zero" line for the Ibero-Basque substratum of Old Spanish (*Orígenes*, § 41) and Wartburg's oft-revised report, stretching between the two versions of his *Ausgliederung*, on the gradual withering of -s in North Italian dialects. The reconciliation of this ethno-historical method, only recently adopted by H. Kuen and, on a more ambitious scale, by K. Baldinger in regard to the Iberian peninsula, with the rival procedures of explicative phonology represents the most urgent problem in present-day Romance linguistics; for some stimulating, if cautious, hints of immediate prospects, see Togeby's incisive review of Weinrich's recent monograph (*RPh.*, XIII, 401-413).

6.2.3. Integration with literary and intellectual history. The interweaving of linguistic and literary history is of such striking importance and intensity in Romance culture – one of the most erudite, literate, and esthetically appealing in the annals of all time – that at first glance the wisdom of leaving the tangled skein intact seems quite obvious.⁴⁵⁾ Accordingly, systematic inquiry into those languages that have served as vehicles of Romance literature, or at least of written communication, has for decades been considered a legitimate academic pursuit; the pendulum has swung between the identification of a separate "standard" ("Schriftsprache", Remacle's *scripta*), as distinct from the many colloquial media, and genuine concern with an artistic vehicle. As regards sheer monumentality, these endeavors have culminated in the set (still incomplete) of Brunot's and Bruneau's learned volumes. Concentration on Italian has produced in fairly rapid succession the less ponderous books by Devoto and, lately, by Migliorini, while on the Spanish side the genre has left an imprint on Lapesa's highly readable *Historia* which, incidentally, no less than Meillet's *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque* (with its triple emphasis on period, area, and

⁴⁵⁾ Significantly, Diez's earliest essay (ca. 1821), known obliquely from mention in an application form, bore the title *Geschichte der Sprache und Poesie der Provenzen*.

genre), drives home the impossibility of drawing any razor-sharp line between this particular projection and the "staircase" perspective, previously defined in purely temporal terms (Section 6.1.2).

Upon closer inspection, however, serious – if not insuperable – difficulties begin to loom in the fusion of the two cognate historical disciplines. For transparent reasons, historical linguistics is at its most impressive in dealing with preliterate periods; in an expert's deft hands, it serves to drive a wedge into partially uncharted territory, a term which in Romance, broadly speaking, connotes the first millennium. The literary material inescapably calls for the reverse stress on later time segments. As a result of this split interest, each successive volume of the Brunot-Bruneau venture, through no fault of its authors, has been progressively skewed in the direction of literature and of its immediate ramifications: In a project so conceived, the farther the best-intentioned scholar advances along this path, the more generous the share of attention he is bound to bestow on stylistics (here taken to mean the study of individual styles), to the lasting detriment of meatier, if less palatable, disciplines. Between inflated accounts of nostalgic and exotic Romanticism, and mordant and earthy Realism as reflected in a language like French, it becomes embarrassingly awkward to insert even a slim matter-of-fact chapter on, say, the phonology of mid-19th-century patois.⁴⁶ After a long promenade through the gardens of poetry, a tasteful Lapesa has recourse to a string of appendages to do belated justice to dialect speech (peninsular, American, Sephardic) which, in a more auspicious context, might have been attached directly to late Old Spanish: a noteworthy illustration of how a slice of literary analysis may positively obstruct a natural concatenation of linguistic events. On the other hand, the tone of Lapesa's lengthy Introduction, dealing in exuberant detail with prehistory's lexical flint-stones, clashes unavoidably with the preëminently stylistic and syntactic facets of his exquisite "Siglo de Oro" chapters. In short, even distinguished works of this kind are bound to suffer from a lack of topical homogeneity and from the absence of a firm geometric design.

Yet even these are not the most formidable drawbacks of the at-

⁴⁶) Paradoxically, though literature usurps increasing amounts of space in works so planned, the "climate" of its discussion may fail to satisfy the fastidious connoisseur of letters. Cf. *RPh.*, VII, 83–86, and VIII, 230–235.

tempted compromise. The core disciplines of linguistics, as represented in historical grammar, pertain to social-science researches; the analyst operates with averages, allowing the individual speaker for once to recede into the background. Conversely, in the study of literary styles powerful personalities come to the fore, bringing to bear their "culturally filtered" private preferences on the tradition of a speech community. Paradoxically, despite the topical remoteness of economic history, that science, which likewise operates with the law of averages, methodologically harmonizes better with diachronic grammar than does the topically contiguous province of literary history. To conclude: On account of inherent complications studies of this mixed type, if at all maintaining a high level of refinement, are likely to remain occasional tidbits rather than the scholar's staple fare.

6.3. *Relation to historical dialectology.* At this point, some statement on the relation of historical grammar to dialectology (understood as the polar opposite of esthetically slanted stylistics) seems overdue. Yet in groping for the proper words one stumbles over two serious difficulties. First, the key word "dialect" is imprecise, even equivocal, since its range varies from language to language, and from decade to decade (thus, in current Continental usage its connotation is strictly regional rather than both territorial and social, and rural rather than urban). Second, with Romance dialects, especially those of older vintage, the contrast to the preceding section is insufficiently neat, since not a few have served as vehicles for literary production (in fact, initially all vernacular literatures were dialectally tinged).

From the vantage point of linguistics the situation seems to be as follows: A standard historical grammar of a major Romance language may, at will, be richly nuanced through constant references to peculiar developments in surrounding dialect speech. This has been particularly true of leading Italian grammars, from Meyer-Lübke's to Rohlfs's, less so, except for the medieval period (Suchier, Schwan-Behrens), of those available for French. For peninsular Spanish, we have numerous historically slanted descriptions of exiguous dialect zones, old (Staaff) and new (Sánchez Sevilla), and a few attempts at a small portfolio of dialect sketches (Música, García de Diego, Zamora Vicente), but no major work comparable in weight and craftsmanship to, say, Thumb's on ancient Greek dialects.

A different situation prevails in a zone which lacks a major literary

language. Under such conditions dialect study alone feeds historical grammar. The first large-scale inquiries so oriented were conducted by Ascoli; in this century, Ronjat's investigations of Occitanian and Wagner's of Sardinian may serve as models. Common to Ronjat, Rohlf, and Wagner is their welcome comparatist bias: They provide no mere succession of isolated miniature sketches, but examine, point by point, the various reactions of the different dialects to essentially the same set of challenges of attrition.

Viewing the situation from the opposite angle of dialect research, one may argue that to start from Latin (as did Krüger in 1914 and later some students of his with regard to Western Spanish) is, all told, a wiser procedure than to catalogue deviations from the closest modern standard (a semi-naïve technique cherished by many native Hispanists; cf. D. Catalán Menéndez-Pidal in *RPh.*, X : 2 [1956], 71-92). Nevertheless, this more praiseworthy procedure entails one drawback: it fails to take cognizance of the effects of diffusion. Structural analysis, not necessarily hostile to diachronism, though at this juncture still predominantly synchronic (Bjerrome), offers additional clues for setting off dialect zones; as a yardstick for gauging the change in scholarly tastes, compare Leite de Vasconcelos's sixty-year-old "classic" treatment of Mirandese with Herculano de Carvalho's recent front-line study.

6.4. Relation to layman's guides and student's manuals. On the periphery of professional linguistic studies one discovers diversified semi-scholarly genres, designed partly to whet the layman's palate, partly to capsule knowledge for the hurried student's consumption. The importance to the expert of this marginal output varies from book to book, depending on the general and the specific authority of the scholar involved and on several concomitants. Some writings of this kind, such as Wagner's *Lingua sarda*, possess genuine value, affording upon occasion more mature, if less technically phrased, appraisals of a controversial problem than earlier monographs by the same author; others, like Trend's superficially glittering *History and language of Spain*, or Faral's ill-fated grammatical outline of Old French, have been rashly prepared by scholars indisputably authoritative, but not in the field at issue; still others, though written by experts in the subject concerned, show so many patent traces of production in "assembly-line tempo" as to discourage sustained interest: This is, unfortunately, true of

Dauzat's last synoptic pictures of French. In such works of broad appeal, historical grammar may either be concentrated – undiluted – in separate chapters (Oliver Asín), or may be dissolved and distributed in small, innocuous doses all over the book, as is true, to remain within the province of popularized Spanish philology, of the familiar syntheses by Entwistle, Spaulding, and Šišmarëv.

6.5. Relation to normative grammar. While the relation between descriptive and prescriptive (normative) grammar is in dispute – some theorists insist that a mere observer and interpreter of linguistic facts, like any other social scientist, should keep aloof from involvement in decisions on “right” vs. “wrong”, while others consider that no persons are better qualified than trained linguists to intervene in precisely such decisions,⁴⁷⁾ – any connection between the historical and the normative approach is, incontrovertibly, tenuous, not to say problematic. Yet it can happen that historical curiosity – leading, in turn, to professional competence – matures as an unexpected by-product of a particularly enlightened and refined manner of initial didacticism. Sometimes, conversion to the new ideal of objective inquiry marks a complete, even dramatic, break with the past (much as our generation has seen descriptivists passionately abjuring their previous apprenticeship in traditional philology). Occasionally, there crystallizes a transitional stage, in which assorted features of the two approaches, for once, appear reconciled in a peculiar amalgam. Cuervo's explanatory notes to Bello's “Castilian” grammar and the successive scrupulous revisions of his *Apuntaciones* on the speech of Bogotá are two prime examples – so too the torso of his “syntactic” dictionary exhibits the transformation of normatively tinted descriptive lexicography (Golden Age and modern section under each entry) into the bald historical projection of linguistic facts (medieval substructures, appended by way of flashbacks). Theoretically, the only defensible bridge between diachronism and prescription would be the assumption – seldom, if

⁴⁷⁾ Not infrequently professional linguists have been called in to preside over discussions of spelling reforms. One is also reminded of T. Navarro's rôle in suggesting a universally valid standard for dialogues in Spanish-language motion pictures; of B. Migliorini's arbitration of Roman and Florentine rival claims to standards of diction on the Italian radio; of Brunot's official collaboration with P. Valéry in the “Office de la langue française”.

ever, validated – that the ideal, enforceably correct state of a language was the one flowing from the configuration of its historical curve rather than from any rival consideration, such as a collective or an individual standard of taste, easily rationalizable. Moreover, at the peak of historicism acquaintance with the rudiments of historical method was temporarily held to represent no mean asset in the practical acquisition of grammar, whether one's own or a foreign (especially a dead) language was involved. As a result of this widespread belief, some drops of diachronism spilled over into advanced collegiate grammars by specialists like Brachet and Egger.

6.6. Relation to etymology, lexicology, and onomastics. There has developed an intricate and elusive set of relationships between the grammatical and the lexical disciplines. That these tend to congeal into polar opposites has been eloquently shown in Romance scholarship by the two crowning achievements of both Diez and Meyer-Lübke: With either scholar, a comparative grammar on historical principles preceded a comparative etymological dictionary by a margin of roughly one decade. On a more modest scale, Brachet's French pioneer studies showed the same characteristic cleavage in the 'sixties (*Grammaire historique . . . , Dictionnaire étymologique . . .*); so did Darmesteter's investigations. In languages boasting only a finite corpus of texts, or so far known through a limited selection of material elicited through dictation, ambitious scholars generally aim at a three-pronged attack on their objective: a reader (chrestomathy, anthology, collection of folk-tales) ordinary flanking either a full-sized grammar or a grammatical sketch, and a vocabulary, which may or may not be etymologically slanted; witness, for an extinct language, Sturtevant's approach to Hittite and, for modern exotic languages, L. Bloomfield's researches, ranging from Tagalog to Eastern Ojibwa (the latter monograph contains an additional list of model sentences). In Romance, except where a language recorded from the lips of its last speaker, such as Dalmatian, invites multi-faceted analysis (M. Bàrtoli), the texts are ordinarily so abundant as to militate against their treatment on a par with lexicon and grammar, save in handy "omnibus volumes" designed for classroom use. For trail-blazers, of course, the borders between the contiguous disciplines were still quite fluid. Eighty years ago, it was less startling than it would be now for a scholar of Ascoli's stature to select, for his commentary on the Surselvan *Barlaam and*

Josaphat version, morphology (including, in great detail, derivation and, more spottily, the "syntax of the word") and chosen problems of lexicology (with special attention to loan words and loan translations), to the rigorous exclusion of phonology – in retrospect, an odd mating of topics.

Attention may first center around theoretical problems, then be allowed to stray to practical implications. The contacts between grammar and lexicon in diachronic projections are at their most intense in phonology and word formation; they remain perceptibly strong in inflection, but grow weaker in syntax.

A phonological treatise, in particular, rests squarely on lexical equations, involving a latent scattered etymological dictionary, as it were. On a modest level of accomplishment Hauschild exemplified this situation by actually compiling (1843) an etymological vocabulary of French based almost in its entirety on Diez's venerable grammar (this cross-section must not be confused with Jarník's two indexes to successive editions of Diez-Scheler's labyrinthine dictionary). If some worker should command adequate skill and enjoy sufficient leisure to prepare a pan-Romanic word-index to Diez's original grammar or, at least, to its phonological component (1836), such inestimable counterview would represent the embryonic stage of that scholar's subsequent dictionary (1853). Conceivably, the impact of grammar on lexicology is most perceptible in a word list containing exclusively reconstructed bases, arrived at preëminently through phonological analysis; witness Gröber's deservedly celebrated *Substrate*. Another narrow bridge between lexicon and phonology is systematic inquiry into doublets (*Scheidewörter*) – whether or not semantically differentiated – as practised from Brachet and Coelho via Michaëlis down to Schuchhardt, since here the prime criterion for discriminating between lexical items has been their different degree of exposure to the agency of relevant sound shifts.

The peculiarities of Romance inflection are such as to make the section or separate monograph (Gassner, Fouché, Lombard) dealing with conjugation a repository of valuable lexical information. The corresponding section on declension is ordinarily too meager – except possibly for Rumanian – to invite systematic consultation by those curious on the lexical side. A differently tilted grammatical structure may, of course, reverse this situation: The "broken plurals" of classical

Arabic affect such a heavy proportion of all nouns as to make any thorough investigation of them a foreseeably handy clue to lexical problems as well.

In word formation, the connubium of the two disciplines reaches its maximum intimacy. The more microscopic the inquiry into a set of suffixes, the greater the share of individual attention accorded to each word. H. Lewicka's copiously documented report on Middle French derivation, as viewed through the prism of comic plays (an approach obliquely echoing Spitzer's earlier Rabelais monograph) showers philological attention so lavishly on each coinage as almost to force the broader outline of patterns into the background.

In practice the uneasy feeling that grammar and lexicon are, in essence, distinct, yet inextricably interwoven, accounts for a number of compromises. Characteristically, Diez's concluding treatise, *Romanische Wortschöpfung* (1875), an unassuming essay in lexical – to be precise, substantival – segmentation of the universe into twenty-seven slices (a few further subdivided), each chapter bracketing several etymological vignettes, was issued as a formal supplement not, as one might have expected, to his dictionary, but to his revised grammar. A few stringently organized historical grammars contain neatly delimited sections on the vocabulary (cf. Gartner's original *Rätoromanische Grammatik*, pp. 1–32, and Part II of Brunot-Bruneau's *Précis*). Such separate chapters, or recurrent subdivisions in consecutive chapters, are even more typical of semiformal or experimental grammars such as Bourciez's *Éléments* and Meillet's *Aperçu* and *Esquisse*, to say nothing of diluted language histories. Introductory chapters concerned with external growth (Diez, Baist) offer additional opportunities for lexical encroachment (see Section 6.2.1, above). Where the same author has a grammar and a dictionary to his credit (Diez, Meyer-Lübke), cross-references are conspicuously frequent. Finally, certain special devices facilitate the use of a grammatical treatise for lexicological research; typically, indexes – selective (Diez) or, better still, exhaustive (Darmesteter, 1874 and 1877; Hanssen, 1910 and 1913) of formations adduced, with complete words and mere affixes interfiled or kept apart. One finds numerous variations, some very ingenious: A few authors, for economy's sake, are satisfied with including items difficult to locate (Meyer-Lübke, 1925), or hidden away in footnotes (E. L. Adams); others restrict themselves either to modern formations

(Bourciez, *Précis*) or, conversely, to etyma (Gartner and Horning, 1883). Normally, the entries of an index appear unaccompanied by comments, but Meyer-Lübke's contains corrections to his comparative grammar, while Gartner's (1904), adapted to his multi-purpose work on Rumanian, includes etymologies beside glosses and, moreover, flanks a Supplement on neologisms ("Kunstwörter").⁴⁸

Of all lexical disciplines, onomastics is probably most remote from grammar, though certain points not only of phonology, but of morphology and syntax as well, can be strikingly illustrated with toponymic material, e.g., the marking of 'possession' in proto-French and Old French. The establishment of effective liaison at this point, beyond the casual inclusion of proper names in the supporting evidence and their occasional listing in a separate index, is an important desideratum.

6.7. Relation to genetic and classificatory studies. A peculiar genre, bordering on historical grammar, especially of the comparative kind (see Section 0.2, above), without quite coinciding with it in scope and spirit of inquiry, is the study in genetic classification. The terminal problem here is to identify a family relationship: either to settle the inclusion of a given language within a family (a matter of gross classification, unless a "mixed" or transitional language is involved) or, a commoner situation in Romance, to pinpoint its specific place inside

⁴⁸ Cf. fn. 43, above. From these "grammatical" indexes one must distinguish such glossaries – bilingual, by definition, except when contrastable stages of the same language are involved – as facilitate the reading of appended illustrative texts (Alemany Bolufer's *Estudio elemental*, Gorra's *Lingua e letteratura*, and Zauner's *Elementarbuch*; Appel's, Crescini's, and Ford's chrestomathies, the first-mentioned equipped with a separate roster of proper names). It happens that Index and Glossary merge into a single reference list (Huber, 1933), or that one book includes both, keeping them tidily apart (B. Wiese's two-column "Wörterverzeichnis zu den Texten" as against his three-column "Wortverzeichnis"; similar arrangement in Schultz-Gora). Recall that a topical and a lexical index may be amalgamated (as in Brunot's *La pensée et la langue* – this index, later polished by Bruneau, is a gem of reference service; cf. also Grandgent, 1905) or be offered separately (3d ed. of Diez's *Grammar*; Grandgent, 1927: "Index Rerum" vs. "Index Verborum"). Gartner's *Handbuch* (1910) is almost overelaborate, containing as it does a German-Raetian "Wörterbüchlein", matching sample texts (pp. ix-xvi), beside two "Wörterverzeichnisse", one a list of etyma (pp. xvii-xx) and the other a list of dialect forms qualifying for written use (pp. xxi-lxi).

the larger unit. The position of Venetic vis-à-vis Italic (M. S. Beeler, as against M. Lejeune and H. Krahe) and such constructs, of dubious legitimacy, as Balto-Slavic and Celto-Italic are relevant issues, within the purview of an Indo-Europeanist. In Romance, the pioneer studies of this nature (e.g., A. Fuchs's posthumous *Die romanischen Sprachen in ihrem Verhältnisse zum Lateinischen*, 1849) are barely distinguishable from "language history"; later the separate development of the genre picked up momentum. A case in point is the controversial status of Catalan vis-à-vis Gallo- and Ibero-Romance (with the phantom of Afro-Romance looming in the distance), a tangle conducive to the debate which culminated in A. Gria's and A. Alonso's independent rebuttals of Meyer-Lübke's vulnerable tract (1925), and Alonso's criticism of Gria's position. The genetic – or typological – status of a border-line dialect invites similar analysis; cf. Sanchis Guarner's cogent plea (1949) for assigning the speech of Aguaviva de Aragón to Western Catalan. The adjudication of a text, especially one of complex transmission, to certain linguistic strains poses comparable problems; cf. Lapesa's stimulating discussion of the Old Asturian *Fuero de Avilés*, shot through with Provençalisms. In all these researches historical grammar supplies the bulk of the requisite ammunition, but represents no aim in itself. Not infrequently, bits of extraneous evidence (areal configuration, archeology, physical anthropology, demography, etc.) are injected into such debates. Linguistic explorers of specific diachronic problems must at all times take into account pertinent literature of this sort, some of it very meritorious, though it hardly typifies historical grammar at its freest and most imaginative.

6.8. Relation to studies in linguistic methodology. Any handbook of general linguistics, like Vendryes's, Sapir's, and Bloomfield's, or of historical linguistics, like Paul's, or of Romance linguistics, like Gröber's – included in his own *Grundriß* – and Meyer-Lübke's (also, on an introductory level, Ettmayer's), is bound to contain, in its illustrations, a good many examples of linguistic change, of direct concern to the linguistic grammarian. The same remark applies to initiations into special methods of diachronic analysis, such as Martinet's and, quite lately, Hoenigswald's. The difficulty for the monographist is best described as mnemonic: It consists in remembering those books and specific passages in which certain facts relevant to his particular project are discussed –, topically, out of context – by way of

exemplifying some point of a vast cross-linguistic methodology.⁴⁹⁾

It is painful to report that, aside from earning a questionable reputation as popularizers of linguistic science (Dauzat, Hall, Pei), Romance scholars have contributed few books on general linguistics; that, of these few, some, outside a narrow circle, have been less than influential (Migliorini, Sandfeld-Jensen), while others have been received with studied coldness (Entwistle's *Aspects*). It is no mere coincidence that explicit joint introductions into general and into Romance linguistics are so rare (for one example, see Coelho's *A língua portuguesa*; cf. also Brunot's *La pensée et la langue*): Their infrequency, no less than the scant attention paid by numerous "general linguists" to the theoretical implications of Romance material, points up a critical gap in the edifice of organized learning.

CONCLUSION

7. A tentative study such as this hardly calls for more than a tentative set of conclusions, subject to revision in the light of additional material and new reflections.

Can one establish a network of significant relations between the individual distinctive features here isolated? Some connections seem to recur too frequently to be casual. Thus, within the category of scope one notes an interrelation between breadth and depth: A com-

⁴⁹⁾ Some day, a more leisurely typological survey may give closer attention to the morphology of titles. The delimiting pattern *From ... to ...*, last favored by Boyd-Bowman (and Rohlf), has been mentioned in fn. 5. Distinctly older – in fact, rooted in Renaissance scholarship – is the schema *Origins of ...*: in Spain, its vogue stretches from B. Aldrete (1606) via G. Mayáns y Siscar (1737) to Menéndez Pidal (1926, 1950). Modern Italian counterparts are G. Alessio's *Le origini del francese*, as well as the books by E. Gorra, P. Savj-Lopez, and C. Tagliavini. Most titles are matter-of-fact, unembellished, and one notes a healthy refusal to eschew the word "grammar", despite its potentially less than pleasant connotation in many influential quarters. Some authors stress the introductory, cursory, or didactic character of their treatment: *Éléments* (Bourciez), *Précis* (Brunot, Bourciez), *Tableau* (Dauzat), *Elementarbuch* (Huber, Schults-Gora, Tiktin, Wiese, Zauner), *Estudio elemental* (Alemany Bolufer), *Manual elemental* (Menéndez Pidal; the qualifier was later omitted), *Perfil* (Devoto), *Lições* (Leite de Vasconcelos), *Vorlesungen* (Wackernagel).

parative historical grammar involving numerous languages is unlikely to limit itself to a short span of time. Another interrelation is that between breadth and direction: The choice of the reverse temporal sequence makes it almost mandatory to operate within a unilinguistic framework. A certain temporal sweep also goes hand in hand with the choice of language history, of the "growth-and-structure" projection, and of the chronological sequence as the prime classifier.

The typologist soon detects a certain conflict between the ideals of maximum latitude and subtlest sophistication. Except in Diez's pioneer effort and possibly in the opening volume of Meyer-Lübke's comparative grammar, the quest for maximum breadth, maximum depth, and especially, maximum comprehensiveness usually coincides with pronounced methodological conservatism: For all their usefulness, monumental undertakings such as Nyrop's six-volume grammar of French and the even bulkier language history by Brunot and Bruneau have not been advantageously known for methodological originality. The keenest minds among the structuralists, while eager to proffer complete or nearly complete descriptions of a given language, have shown marked caution, not to say hesitancy, about extending their new methods to more than relatively small slices, only in a few instances cross-linguistic, of historical material. The chronological and the "growth-and-structure" projections have likewise been applied with impressive consistency to single languages, even where their practitioners were demonstrably versatile comparatists' (Meillet, Richter).

The temporary decline of historical grammar is attributable to an ensemble of unfavorable circumstances: a vast accumulation of raw materials and unintegrated monographs, without commensurate progress in analytical ordering or even in mere indexing; an infelicitous status – conducive to meager response – of academic courses devoted to it, within the total configuration of study programs, the world over, in classical and, particularly, in "modern" languages; the unremitting pressure exerted by lay readers – and by publishers who must cater to their tastes – in the direction of heightened amenity, a quality one can rightly expect to find in certain language histories (specifically those attentive to the contacts between literature and its linguistic medium), but scarcely in historical grammar, quasi-mathematical in its desirable austerity; finally, the dual demands for novelty and for

greater earthiness which, for three long decades after 1910, gave such powerful impetus to lexicology and dialect geography, unfortunately at the exorbitant cost of suspended concern with the linguistic core disciplines.

The prospects of revival are today less bleak than they were twenty years ago. Now that the novelty of straight descriptivism has begun to wear off, now that lexicocentric linguistic geography certainly is past its peak, a golden opportunity for a new attack on diachronic structure is rapidly approaching. This opportunity cannot be made good through an unimaginative return to past practice. To be re-activated, historical grammar must move in the direction of general glottodynamics, not only away from the cloggy detail and toward a more coherent integration of the whole, but at the same time ever closer to the establishment of truly evolutionary – beside essentially static – categories of transformation.

University of California

YAKOV MALKIEL

BIBLIOGRAPHIC SUPPLEMENT

[Most of the items mentioned, or alluded to, in the article, have been included in this Bibliography; no need was felt to list standard textbooks of general linguistics or certain easily identifiable studies briefly contrasted with historical grammars. The writer has personally examined, with widely varying degrees of attention, practically all books here recorded, but not all editions of those that were published more than once; on a few such editions even indirect information was sorely deficient. Authors' names are listed in alphabetic order, but, under each entry, the publications – regardless whether books or articles – follow a roughly chronological sequence. Ordinarily, biographical data accompany only posthumous items, except for random clues to separately dated prefaces and the like. Initials appear consistently in lieu of first and middle names, but titles and subtitles have, for the most part, been left unshortened, on account of their preponderant descriptiveness. Unless otherwise indicated, publisher and place of publication have remained unchanged throughout successive editions. Mention has been made of translations to the extent that they may indicate the reading public's demand and response. References to significant book reviews (and, occasionally, to authors' rebuttals) are fairly unsystematic; so are other subsidiary bibliographic signposts. In German and Portuguese 19th-century titles the spelling has been slightly modernized; the few Russian titles

appear transliterated; there has been no tampering with the original names of publication places. Abbreviations of learned journals, monograph series, and the like are strictly standard and may be resolved with the aid of any formal guide to Romance bibliography.]

- ADAMS, E. L., *Word-formation in Provençal*. Univ. Mich. Studies, Human. Ser., II (New York-London: Macmillan, 1913).
- ALARCOS LLORACH, E., *Fonología española (según el método de la escuela de Praga)*. BRH (Madrid: Gredos, 1950); 2d rev. ed. (1954). Cf. W. H. Jacobsen, Jr. in *RPh.*, X (1956-57), 258-266.
- ALDRETE, B. J., (†1645) *Del origen y principio de la lengua castellana ò romance que oi se usa en España* (Roma: Vulliet, 1606); 2d ed. (Madrid: de Léon, 1674).
- ALEMANY Y BOLUFER, J., *Estudio elemental de gramática histórica de la lengua castellana*, 3d ed. (Madrid, 1911); 5th ed. (1919); 6th ed. (1928). Id., "Tratado de la formación de palabras en la lengua castellana, la derivación y la composición, estudio de los sufijos y prefijos empleados en una y otra", *BRAE*, IV (1917), 564-597; V (1918), 70-88, 169-191, 333-349, 469-491, 648-667; reprint (Madrid: Suárez, 1920).
- ALESSIO, G., *Le origini del francese; introduzione alla grammatica storica* (Firenze: Sansoni, 1946). Id., *Grammatica storica francese*, 2 vols. [I: Introduzione-Fonetica; II: Morfologia] (Bari: "Leonardo da Vinci" [1951-55]).
- ALLEN, J. H. D., JR., *Portuguese word-formation with suffixes*. "Language" Dissertation, No. 33 (Baltimore, Md.: Linguistic Society of America, 1941). Cf. Y. Malkiel in *Lang.*, XVIII (1942), 51-62.
- ALONSO, A., (†1952) [with R. Menéndez Pidal], "La subagrupación románica del catalán", *RFE*, XIII (1926), 1-38, 225-261, reprinted in *Estudios lingüísticos: temas españoles*, BRH (Madrid: Gredos [1951]), pp. 11-100. Id., "Partición de las lenguas romances de Occidente", *Miscel'ánea [Pompeu] Fabra* (Buenos Aires, 1943), pp. 81-101; reprinted in *Estudios lingüísticos . . .*, pp. 101-127. Id., *De la pronunciación medieval a la moderna en español*, I, BRH (Madrid: Gredos [1955]), cf. Y. Malkiel in *RPh.*, IX (1955-56), 237-252.
- APPEL, C., *Provenzalische Chrestomathie mit Abriß der Formenlehre und Glossar* (Leipzig: Reisland, 1895); 2d rev. ed. (1902); 4th ed. (1912); 5th ed. (1920); 6th ed. (1930). Supplementary fascicle: *Abriß der Lautlehre* (1918).
- ASCOLI, G. I., "Saggi ladini", *AGI*, I (1873), 1-537. Id., "Schizzi franco-provenzali", *ibid.*, III (1878), 61-120. Id., "Annotazioni sistematiche al Barlaam e Giosafat soprasilvano; saggio di morfologia e lessicologia soprasilvana", *ibid.*, VII (1880-83), 406-602.
- AUERBACH, E., *Introduction aux études de philologie romane* (Frankfurt a.M.: Klostermann [1949]; written in Istanbul, 1943).
- BAIST, G., "Die spanische Sprache", in G. Gröber, *Grundriß . . .*, I (1888), 689-714; 2d ed. (1904-06), 878-915.
- BALDINGER, K., *Kollektivsuffixe und Kollektivbegriff. Ein Beitrag zur Bedeutungslehre im Französischen mit Berücksichtigung der Mundarten*. Deutsche

- Akademie der Wissenschaften: Veröff. des Inst. f. Rom. Sprachw., I (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1950). Id., *Die Herausbildung der Sprachräume auf der Pyrenäenhalbinsel; Querschnitt durch die neueste Forschung und Versuch einer Synthese* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1958).
- BALLY, CH., (†1947) *Traité de stylistique française*. 2 vols. (Heidelberg: Winter, 1909). Id., *Linguistique générale et linguistique française* (Paris: Leroux, 1932). 2d rev. ed. (Berne: Francke [1944]); 3d ed. [reprint] (1950).
- BARTOLI, M. G., *Das Dalmatische; altromanische Sprachreste von Veglia bis Ragusa und ihre Stellung in der apennino-balkanischen Romania*. Kais. Akad. Wiss., II: Romanische Dialektstudien, I-II (Wien: Holder, 1906).
- BEELER, M. S., *The Venetic language*. UCPL, IV: 1 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1949).
- BEHRENS, D., *Beiträge zur französischen Wortgeschichte und Grammatik. Studien und Kritiken* (Halle a.S.: Niemeyer, 1910).
- BJERROME, G., *Le patois de Bagnes (Valais)*. Romanica Gothoburgensia, VI (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1957).
- BLOOMFIELD, L., (†1949) *Tagalog texts with grammatical analysis*. Univ. of Illinois St. in Lang. & Lit., III: 2-4 (Urbana, 1917). Id., *Eastern Ojibwa; grammatical sketch, texts, and word list* [ed. C. F. Hockett] (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957; field work completed in 1938).
- BOURCIEZ, É., (†1946) *Précis historique de phonétique française*, 3d ed. (Paris: Klincksieck, 1907); 4th ed. (1914); 5th ed. (1921); 6th ed. (1926); 7th ed. (1930); 8th ed. (1937; "plusieurs tirages auxiliaires"); 9th ed., rev. by J. Bourciez (1958); the original edition (1889) was titled: *Précis de phonétique française; ou, Exposé des lois qui régissent la transformation des mots latins en français*. Id., *Éléments de linguistique romane* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1910); 2d rev. ed. (1923); 3d ed. (1930); 4th ed., rev. by J. Bourciez (1946); tr. T. V. and E. V. Vencel (ed. D. E. Mihalči): *Osnovy románskogo jazykoznanija* (Moskvá: Izd. Inostránnoj literatúry, 1952).
- BOYD-BOWMAN, P., *From Latin to Romance in sound charts* (n. p., 1954).
- BRACHET, A., (†1898) *Du rôle des voyelles latines atones dans les langues romanes* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1866). Id., *Grammaire historique de la langue française* (Paris: Hetzel, 1867); 2d ed. (ca. 1868); 7th ed. (ca. 1873); 27th ed. (after 1886); 37th ed. (after 1900); tr. G. W. Kitchin [with M. Müller's assistance]: *A historical grammar of the French tongue* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1869, 1872); 7th ed., corrected from the 20th French ed. (1888); rewritten and enlarged by P. Toynbee (1896). Id., *Dictionnaire des doublets ou doubles formes de la langue française* (Paris: Franck, 1868); Supplément (1871). Id., *Morceaux choisis des grands écrivains français du XVI^e siècle, accompagnés d'une grammaire et d'un dictionnaire ...* (Paris: Hachette, n.d.). Id., *Cours de grammaire française, fondé sur l'histoire de la langue; théorie et exercices. Cours supérieur*, rev. ed. (Paris, 1899).
- BRUNEAU, C., *Petite histoire de la langue française*. 2 vols. [I: Des origines à la Révolution; II: De la Révolution à nos jours] (Paris: Colin, 1955-58).
- BRUNOT, F., (†1938) *Précis de grammaire de la langue française, avec une intro-*

- duction sur les origines et le développement de cette langue* (Paris: Masson, 1887 [written: 1884–86]); 2d ed. (1889); 3d ed. (1894); 4th ed. (1899). New ed., completely revised by C. Bruneau (Paris: Masson et Cie., 1933); 2d rev. ed. (1937); 3d ed., completely revised (1949), cf. E. Gamillscheg in *ZRPh.*, LXVIII (1952), 424–449. Id., *Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900* [in Vols. XII–XIII: ... à nos jours]. Vols. I–XII [several divided into sub-volumes] (Paris: Colin, 1905–53; continued). There exist a 2d and a 3d rev. ed. of Vol. I and a 2d rev. ed. of Vols. II–III and VII. Id., *La pensée et la langue: méthode, principes et plan d'une théorie nouvelle du langage appliquées au français* (Paris: Masson, 1922); 3d ed. [with the assistance of C. Bruneau] (1935).
- BUCETA, E., "La tendencia a identificar el español con el latín; un episodio cuatrocenista" [1498, Garcilaso de la Vega], in *Homenaje a Menéndez Pidal* (Madrid, 1925), I, 85–108.
- BUCK, C. D., *Comparative grammar of Greek and Latin* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1933; reprinted, 1955).
- COELHO, F. A., "Sobre a língua portuguesa", in Frei Domingos Vieira, *Tesouro da língua portuguesa*, I (Porto, 1871), pp. ix–ccxlviii. Id., "Formes divergentes de mots portugais", *Rom.*, II (1873), 281–294. Id., *A língua portuguesa; noções de glotologia geral e especial portuguesa* (Lisboa: Magalhães & Moniz, 1881); 2d rev. ed. (1887).
- COHN, G., *Die Suffixwandlungen im Vulgärlatein und im vorliterarischen Französisch nach ihren Spuren im Neufranzösischen* (Halle a.S.: Niemeyer, 1891).
- CORNU, J., "Die portugiesische Sprache", in G. Gröber, *Grundriß* ..., I (1888), 715–803; 2d ed. (1904–06), 916–1037.
- CRESCINI, V., *Manualetto provenzale per uso degli alunni delle facoltà di lettere; introduzione grammaticale, cretostomazia, glossario* (Verona-Padova: Drucker, 1892–94); 2d ed. ["accresciuta"] (1905); 3d ed. [*Manuale per l'avviamento agli studi provenzali*] (Milano: Hoepli, 1926).
- CUERVO, R. J., (†1911) *Apuntaciones críticas sobre el lenguaje bogotano* (Bogotá: Guarín, 1867–72); 2d rev. ed. (Bogotá: Echeverría Hnos., 1876); 3d rev. ed. (Bogotá, 1881); 4th rev. ed. (Chartres, 1885); 5th rev. ed. [... *con frecuente referencia al de los países de Hispano-América*] (Paris: Roger & Chernoviz, 1907); 6th ed. (Paris, 1914); 7th ed. (Bogotá: "El Gráfico", 1939); 9th ed. (Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo, 1955). Id., *Notas a la Gramática de la lengua castellana destinada al uso de los americanos de Andrés Bello* (included in numerous editions of Bello, e.g., 11th ed. [Paris, 1908]). Id., "Disquisiciones sobre antigua ortografía y pronunciación castellanas", *RHi*, II (1894), 1–69; rev. ed. in *Obras inéditas*, eds. F. Restrepo [and P. U. González de la Calle] (Bogotá, 1944), pp. 351–492. Id., "Castellano popular y castellano literario", in *Obras inéditas*, pp. 1–318.
- DARMESTETER, A., (†1888) *Traité de la formation des mots composés dans la langue française comparée aux autres langues romanes et au latin*. BÉHÉ, XIX (Paris: Franck-Vieweg, 1874). Id., *De la création actuelle de mots nouveaux dans la langue française, et des lois qui la régissent* (Paris: Vieweg, 1877). Id. (with A. Hatzfeld), "Tableau de la langue française au XVI^e siècle", in *Le*

- seizième siècle en France (Paris: Delagrave, 1878); 2d ed. (1883); 3d ed. (1886); 7th ed. (n.d.); 12th ed. (1919), frequently bound with *Morceaux en prose et en vers choisis* ... Id., "Traité de la formation de la langue française", rev. by L. Sudre and A. Thomas, in Darmesteter, Hatzfeld, and Thomas, *Dictionnaire général de la langue française* (Paris: Delagrave [1890-1900]), pp. 1-300; 6th ed. (1920). Id., *Cours de grammaire historique de la langue française*, 4 vols., eds. E. Muret [only 1st ed.] and L. Sudre [later also P. Laurent] (Paris: Delagrave, 1891-97); 8th ed. (ca. 1913); 9th ed. (ca. 1914); 12th ed. (ca. 1931); 14th ed. (ca. 1934; sets frequently include volumes of different editions); tr. A. Hartog: *A historical French grammar* (London-New York: Macmillan, 1899); reprinted 1907, 1922, 1934.
- DAUZAT, A., *La langue française; sa vie, son évolution* (Paris: Stock, 1926). Id., *Histoire de la langue française* (Paris: Payot, 1930). Id., *Tableau de la langue française: origines, évolution, structure actuelle* (Paris: Payot, 1939). Id., *Les étapes de la langue française* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1944); 3d ed. (1953). Id., *Précis d'histoire de la langue et du vocabulaire français* (Paris: Larousse, 1949). Id., *Phonétique et grammaire historiques de la langue française* (Paris: Larousse [1950]).
- DEFERRARI, H. A., (†1950) *The phonology of Italian, Spanish, and French* (Washington, D.C.: [Roy J. Deferrari, Publ.] 1954).
- DELATTRE, P., "Stages of Old French phonetic changes observed in Modern Spanish", *PMLA*, LXI (1946), 7-41.
- DENSUSIANU, O., *Histoire de la langue roumaine* [I: Les origines; II: Le seizième siècle] (Paris: Leroux, 1901, 19 [14-26-]38).
- DEVOTO, G., *Profilo di storia linguistica italiana* (Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1953).
- DIEZ, F., (†1876) *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*, 3 vols. (Bonn: Weber, 1836-44) [orig. Preface reprinted in *Diez-Reliquien* ..., ed. E. Stengel (Munich: Elwert, 1894), pp. 15-17]; 2d ed. ["neu verfaßt"] (Bonn, 1856-60), cf. *Introduction à la Grammaire des langues romanes*, tr. G. Paris (Paris: Franck, 1863), and *Introduction to the Grammar of the Romance languages: Elements and jurisdiction of the Romance languages*, tr. C. B. Cayley (London-Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate, 1863); 3d ed. ["neu bearbeitet und vermehrt"] (Bonn, 1870-72); tr. A. Brachet, A. Morel-Fatio, and G. Paris (Paris: Franck [Vieweg], 1874-76); 4th ed. (Bonn, 1876-77); 5th ed. [eds. F. Apfelstedt and E. Seelmann] (Bonn: Weber [Flittner], 1882), consecutively pagged; "Handschriftliche Kollektaneen zur Romanischen Grammatik [2d and 3d ed.] aus den letzten 60er und den ersten 70er Jahren", in *Diez-Reliquien*, pp. 4-14. Id., *Grammatik ... Anhang: Romanische Wortschöpfung* (Bonn: Weber, 1875 [Preface dated 1874]).
- EGGER, É., *Notions élémentaires de grammaire comparée pour servir à l'étude des trois langues classiques* ... (Paris: Durand, 1852); 8th ed. (1880).
- ELCOCK, W. D., *The Romance languages* (London: Faber & Faber, New York: Macmillan [1960]).
- ENTWISTLE, W. J., *The Spanish language, together with Portuguese, Catalan, and*

Basque (London: Faber & Faber [1936]; New York: Macmillan, 1938). Id., *Aspects of language* (London: Faber & Faber, 1953).

ERNOUT, A., *Morphologie historique du latin* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1914); 2d rev. ed. (1927); 3d rev. ed. (1953); tr. H. Meltzner [*Historische Formenlehre des Lateinischen*], Indog. Bibl., II: 5 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1913); 2d and 3d ed. (1920).

ETTMAYER, K. VON, *Vademekum für Studierende der romanischen Philologie* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1919).

EWERT, A., *The French language* (London: Faber & Faber, 1933); 2d ed. (1943); reprinted 1947, 1949.

FARAL, E., *Petite grammaire de l'ancien français: XII^e–XIII^e siècles* (Paris: Hachette [1941]).

FERNÁNDEZ LLERA, V., *Gramática y vocabulario del Fuero Juzgo* [1900] (Madrid: R. Academia Española, 1929).

FÖRSTER, P., *Spanische Sprachlehre* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1880).

FORD, J. D. M., "The Old Spanish sibilants" [Harvard dissertation, 1897], [*Harvard*] *Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, VII (1900), 1–182. Id., ed. *Old Spanish readings selected on the basis of critically edited texts; edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary, by ...* (Boston, New York, etc.: Ginn [1911]; orig. ed. [1906] lacked these three sections).

FOUCHÉ, P., *Le verbe français; étude morphologique*. PFLS, LVI (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1931).

FOULET, L., *Petite syntaxe de l'ancien français*. CFMA, II: 2 (Paris: Champion, 1919); 2d rev. ed. (1923); 3d rev. ed. (1930; Preface dated 1928).

FUCHS, A., (†1847). *Über die sogenannten unregelmäßigen Zeitwörter in den romanischen Sprachen; nebst Andeutungen über die wichtigsten romanischen Mundarten* (Berlin: Asher, 1840). Id., *Die romanischen Sprachen in ihrem Verhältnisse zum Lateinischen; nebst einer Karte des romanischen Sprachgebiets in Europa*, ed. [L.G.] Blanc (Halle: Schmidt, 1849).

GAMILLSCHEG, E., "Grundzüge der galloromanischen Wortbildung", in Gamillscheg and Spitzer, *Beiträge zur romanischen Wortbildungslehre*. BAR, II: 2 (Genève: Olschki, 1921), pp. 1–80. Id., *Französische Bedeutungslehre* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1951; Preface dated 1949). Id., *Historische französische Syntax* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1957–58).

GARCÍA DE DIEGO, V., *Elementos de gramática histórica castellana* (Burgos: "El monte Carmelo", 1914). Id., *Manual de dialectología española* (Madrid: Instituto de Cultura Hispánica, 1946). Id., *Gramática histórica española* (Madrid: Gredos, 1951).

GARTNER, T., *Rätoromanische Grammatik* (Heilbronn: Henninger, 1883). Id., "Die rätoromanischen Mundarten", in G. Gröber, *Grundriß ... I* (1888), 461–488; 2d ed. (1904–06), 608–636. Id., *Darstellung der rumänischen Sprache*. SKL, V (Halle: Niemeyer, 1910).

GASSNER, A., *Das altspanische Verbum* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1897).

GORRA, E., *Lingue neolatine*. "Manuali Hoepli" (Milano: Hoepli, 1894). Id. *Lingua e letteratura spagnuola delle origini* (Milano: Hoepli, 1898).

- GOSSEN, C.-T., *Petite grammaire de l'ancien picard; phonétique - morphologie - syntaxe; anthologie et glossaire* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1951). Cf. C. Régnier'ss rev. in *RPh.*, XIV: 3 (1961), 255-272.
- GOUGENHEIM, G., *Grammaire de la langue française du seizième siècle*. "Les langues du monde" (Lyon-Paris: IAC [1951]).
- GRANDGENT, C. H., *An outline of the phonology and morphology of Old Provençal* (Boston: Heath, 1905). Id., *From Latin to Italian; an historical outline of the phonology and morphology of the Italian language* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927).
- GRIERA, A., "Afro-romànic o ibero-romànic?", *BDC*, X (1922), 34-53; "Castellà-català-provençal" [Rev. of Meyer-Lübke, *Das Katalanische*], *ZRPh.*, XLV (1925), 198-251, cf. M.-L.'s rejoinder, *ibid.*, XLVI, 116-128.
- GRÖBER, G., "Vulgärlateinische Substrate romanischer Wörter", *ALLG*, I (1884), 204-254 (A-B), 539-557 (C); II (1885), 100-107 (D), 276-288 (E-Fi), 424-443 (Fl-G); III (1886), 138-143 (H-II), 264-275 (II-La), 507-531 (La-Mi); IV (1887), 116-136 (Mi-N), 422-454 (O-P); V (1888), 125-132 (Q-Ra), 234-242 (Re-Ru), 453-486 (S); VI (1889), 117-149 (T-Z), 377-397 (Supplement). Id., ed. *Grundriß der romanischen Philologie*, I (Straßburg: Trübner, 1888 [project launched: 1883; Preface dated: 1887]); 2d rev. ed. (1904-06). Id., "Methodik und Aufgaben der sprachwissenschaftlichen Forschung", in *Grundriß* . . . , I (1888), 209-250. To the 2d ed. (1904) G. contributed "Einführung in die romanische Philologie" [A. Geschichte . . . ; B. Aufgabe und Gliederung], pp. 1-202, and "Anleitung zur philologischen Forschung" [A. Quellen . . . ; B. Behandlung der Quellen], pp. 203-368.
- GUARNERIO, P. E., *Fonologia romanza*. "Manuali Hoepli" (Milano: Hoepli, 1918).
- HAAS, J., *Neufranzösische Syntax*. SKL, IV (Halle: Niemeyer, 1909). Id., *Französische Syntax* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1916). Id., *Abriß der französischen Syntax*. SKL, VIII (Halle: Niemeyer, 1922).
- HANSEN, F., *Spanische Grammatik auf historischer Grundlage*. SKL, VI (Halle: Niemeyer, 1910). Id., *Gramática histórica de la lengua castellana* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1913), cf. A. Castro in *RFE*, I (1914), 97-103, 181-183, also O. J. Tallgren in *NM*, XVIII (1917), 138-158 and F. Krüger in *RFE*, VIII (1921), 311-318; reprinted, with new Preface by L. Alfonso (Buenos Aires: El Ateneo, 1945).
- HASSELROT, B., *Études sur la formation diminutive dans les langues romanes*. UUA, 1957, No. XI.
- HATZFELD, H., *Leitfaden der vergleichenden Bedeutungslehre. Versuch einer Zusammenstellung charakteristischen semasiologischen Beispielmateriale aus den bekanntesten Sprachen* (München: Hueber, 1924).
- HAUDRICOURT, A. G., and A. G. JUILLAND, *Essai pour une histoire structurale du phonétisme français* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1949).
- HAUSCHILD, E. J., *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der französischen Sprache nach Friedrich Diez sowie Frisch . . . , mit durchgängiger Verweisung auf Diez's "Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen"* (Leipzig: Hinrich, 1843).

- HEATWOLE, O. W., *Comparative practical grammar of French, Spanish, and Italian*; Foreword by M. A. Pei (New York: Vanni [1949]).
- HOFMANN, J. B., "Syntax und Stilistik", in Stolz-Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*, 5th rev. ed. (1928).
- HOLMES, U. T., JR., and A. H. SCHUTZ, *A history of the French language* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart [1938]; issued in three mimeographed editions since 1933).
- HORNING, A., *Zur Geschichte des lateinischen C vor E und I im Romanischen* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1883). Id., "Die Suffixe -*iccus*, -*occus*, -*uccus* im Französischen", *ZRPh.*, XIX (1895), 170-188. Id., "Die Suffixe -*accus*, -*iccus*, -*occus*, -*ucus* (-*uccus*) im Romanischen", *ibid.*, XX (1896), 335-353.
- HUBER, J., *Altportugiesisches Elementarbuch*. SRE, I: 8 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1933).
- JESPERSEN, O., (†1943) *Growth and structure of the English language* (Leipzig: Teubner, etc., 1905); 2d rev. ed. (1912); 3d rev. ed. (1919); 4th ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, and New York: Appleton, 1923); 5th ed. (Teubner and Blackwell, 1926); 6th ed. (1930); 9th ed. (Blackwell, 1948; also New York: Doubleday ["Anchor Book" A46], 1955).
- JORDAN, L., *Altfranzösisches Elementarbuch; Einführung in das historische Studium der französischen Sprache und ihrer Mundarten* (Bielefeld-Leipzig: Velhagen & Klasing, 1923).
- JORET, C., *Du C [latin] dans les langues romanes*. BÉHÉ, XVI (Paris: Franck, 1874; Preface dated 1873).
- JUD, J., "Probleme der altromanischen Wortgeographie" [1913], *ZRPh.*, XXXVIII (1914-17), 1-75 and five folding maps.
- KAHANE, H. and R., "The augmentative feminine in the Romance languages", *RPh.*, II: 2-3 (1948-49), 135-175.
- KELLER, A., ed., *Altspanisches Lesebuch mit Grammatik und Glossar* (Leipzig, 1890). Id., *Historische Formenlehre der spanischen Sprache* (Murrhardt, Wtb.: Lang, 1894).
- KENISTON, H., *The syntax of Castilian prose*, [II:] *The sixteenth century* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937).
- KRAHE, H., *Das Venetische; seine Stellung im Kreise der verwandten Sprachen* (Heidelberg, 1950). Id., *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*, 3d rev. ed., I: *Einleitung und Lautlehre*. Götschen Sammlung, No. 59 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1958).
- KRÜGER, F., *Studien zur Lautgeschichte westspanischer Mundarten auf Grund von Untersuchungen an Ort und Stelle; mit Notizen zur Verbalflexion* (Hamburg, 1914; orig. in *Jb. Hamb. Wiss. Anst.*, XXXI [1913]). Id., *Einführung in das Neuspanische* (Leipzig-Berlin: Teubner, 1924).
- KUEN, H., "Die sprachlichen Verhältnisse auf der Pyrenäenhalbinsel", *ZRPh.*, LXVI (1950), 95-125 ["Vortrag, überarbeitet und mit Anmerkungen versehen").
- KUHN, A., "Der hocharagonesische Dialekt" [Habilitationsschrift, Leipzig], *RLiR*, XI (1935), 1-312. Id., *Romanische Philologie*, I: *Die romanischen Spra-*

- chen. Wissenschaftliche Forschungsberichte, Geisteswiss. Reihe, VIII (Bern: Francke, 1951); cf. Y. Malkiel in *Lang.*, XXVIII (1952), 509–524.
- KURYŁOWICZ, J., *L'accentuation des langues indo-européennes*, Prace Komisji Językowej, XXXVII (Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1952); 2d ed., Prace Językoznawcze, XVII (Wrocław-Kraków: Polska Akademia Nauk, 1958). Id., *L'apophonie en indo-européen*. Prace Językoznawcze, IX (Wrocław: Polska Ak. Nauk, 1956).
- LAPESA, R., *Historia de la lengua española* (Madrid: Escelicer [1942]); 2d rev. ed. [1951], cf. Y. Malkiel in *RPh.*, VI: 1 (1952), 52–63; 3d ed. [1955]; 4th ed. [1959]. Id., *Asturiano y provenzal en el Fuero de Avilés*, Acta Salmanticensia: Filosofía y Letras, II: 4 (1948).
- LAUSBERG, H., *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft*, 2 vols. [I: Einleitung und Vokalismus; II: Konsonantismus]. Sammlung Götschen, Nos. 128–128a, 250 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1956).
- LEITE DE VASCONCELOS, J., (†1941) *Estudos de filologia mirandesa*, 2 vols. (Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional, 1900–01). Id., *Lições de filologia portuguesa* (Lisboa, 1911); 2d rev. ed. (Lisboa: Biblioteca Nacional, 1926); 3d ed. (ed. S. da Silva Neto), Coleção Brasileira de Filologia Portuguesa (Rio de Janeiro: Livros de Portugal, 1959).
- LEJEUNE, M., [Miscellaneous articles.]
- LERCH, E., *Historische französische Syntax*, 3 vols. (Leipzig: Reisland, 1925–34). Id., *Hauptprobleme der französischen Sprache*, 2 vols. (Braunschweig, etc.: Westermann, 1930).
- LEUMANN, M., "Laut- und Formenlehre", in Stolz-Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*, 5th rev. ed. (1928).
- LEWICKA, H., *La langue et le style du théâtre comique français des XIV^e et XV^e siècles*, I: *La dérivation* (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, and Paris: Klincksieck [1960]).
- LÖFSTEDT, E., *Philologischer Kommentar zur "Peregrinatio Aetheriae"; Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache* (Uppsala, 1911).
- LUQUIENS, F. B., *An introduction to Old French phonology and morphology* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1909); 2d rev. ed. (1919); 3d ed. (1926); 4th ed. (Yale and Oxford University Press, 1934).
- MARTINET, A., "The unvoicing of Old Spanish sibilants", *RPh.*, V: 2–3 (1951–52), 133–156. Id., "Celtic lenition and Western Romance consonants", *Lang.*, XXVIII (1952), 192–217. [A condensed translation of both articles is included in *Économie des changements phonétiques; traité de phonologie diachronique*. Bibl. Rom., I: 10 (Berne: Francke, 1955)].
- MAYÁNS Y SISCAR, G., (†1781) *Orígenes de la lengua española, compuestos por varios autores, recogidos por ...*, 2 vols. (Madrid: de Zúñiga, 1737); eds. J. E. Hartzenbusch and E. de Mier, "La amistad librera" ([Madrid] Suárez, 1873).
- MEILLET, A., (†1936) *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique* (Vienne: PP. Mékhitaristes, 1903); 2d rev. ed. (1936); cf. *Allarmenisches Elementarbuch* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1913). Id., *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque* (Paris: Hachette, 1913); 2d rev. ed. (1920); 3d rev. ed. (1930);

5th ed. [ca. 1938]. Id., *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine* (Paris: Hachette, 1928); 2d rev. ed. (1931); 3d rev. ed. (1933); 6th ed. [1952]. Id., with J. Vendryès, *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques* (Paris: Champion, 1924); 2d printing (1927); 2d ed., rev. by Vendryès (1948).

MENÉNDEZ PIDAL, R., *Manual (elemental) de gramática histórica española* (Madrid: Suárez, 1904); 2d rev. ed. (1905); 3d ed. ["con muy escasas reformas"] (1914); 4th rev. ed. (1918); 5th rev. ed. (1925; new printing, 1929); 6th rev. ed. (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1941); all subsequent editions (10th, 1958) are merely new printings. Id., "Sufijos átonos en español" [1903], in *Bausteine zur romanischen Philologie; Festgabe für Adolfo Mussafia* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1905), pp. 386–400. Id., ed. "Cantar de Mio Cid": *texto, gramática* [pp. 137–420] y *vocabulario*, 3 vols., with consecutive page numbering (Madrid: Bailly-Baillière [printer], 1908–11); 2d rev. ed., included in *Obras completas*, III–V (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1944–46; cf. Supplement, pp. 1165–1209). Id., *Orígenes del español; estado lingüístico de la Península Ibérica hasta el siglo XI*, Supplement Vol. I to *RFE* (Madrid: Hernando, 1926); 2d rev. ed. (1929); 3d ed., completely revised (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1950; *Obras completas*, VIII); 4th ed. (reprint). MEYER, G., "Die lateinischen Elemente im Albanesischen", in G. Gröber, *Grundriß . . .*, I (1888), 804–821; 2d ed. (1906), rev. by W. Meyer-Lübke, pp. 1038–57.

MEYER-LÜBKE, W., (†1936) *Italienische Grammatik* (Leipzig: Reisland, 1890); tr. M. Bartoli and G. Braun [*Grammatica storico-comparata della lingua italiana e dei dialetti toscani; riduzione ad uso degli studenti di lettere . . .* (Torino: Loescher, 1901)]; new ed. ["con aggiunte dell'autore e di E. G. Parodi"], ed. M. Bartoli (Torino: Chiantore, 1931). Id., *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*, 4 vols. [I: Lautlehre, II: Formenlehre, III: Syntax, IV: Register] (Leipzig: Fues [Reisland], 1890–1902); tr. E. Rabet (I), A. and G. Doutrepont (II–III), id., with A. Counson (IV) [*Grammaire des langues romanes*] (Paris: Welter, 1900–06); reprint (New York, etc.: Stechert, 1923). Id., *Einführung in das Studium der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft*. SRE, I: 1 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1901); 2d rev. ed. (1909) and tr. A. Castro [*Introducción al estudio de la lingüística romance*] (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1914), also [unauthorized] A. da Guerra Júdice [*Introdução ao estudo da glotologia românica*] (Lisboa: Teixeira, 1916); 3d rev. ed. (1920) and expanded tr. A. Castro (1926). Id., *Historische Grammatik der französischen Sprache*. SRE, I: 2; I: Laut- und Flexionslehre (Heidelberg: Winter, 1908); 2d and 3d rev. ed. (1913); 4th and 5th rev. ed. (1934), cf. E. Gamillscheg in *ZFSL*, LX (1935), 484–490; II: Wortbildungslehre (1921), cf. L. Spitzer in *AR*, VII (1923), 194–210. Id., "Die romanischen Sprachen" [1904], in H. Zimmer, H. Morf, et al., *Die romanischen Literaturen und Sprachen, mit Einschluß des Keltischen* (Berlin-Leipzig: Teubner, 1909; a volume forming part of *Die Kultur der Gegenwart . . .*, ed. P. Hinneberg), pp. 447–470. Id., *Das Katalanische; seine Stellung zum Spanischen und Provenzalischen sprachwissenschaftlich und historisch dargestellt*. SRE, V: 7 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1925); for reactions cf. A. Alonso and A. Giera, above. Id., "Die Schicksale des lateinischen L im

- Romanischen", *Sächs. Ak. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl., Verh.*, LXXXVI: 2 (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1934). For instances of editorial collaboration see under G. Meyer, above, and F. d'Ovidio, below.
- MICHAËLIS (DE VASCONCELOS), C., *Studien zur romanischen Wortschöpfung* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1876). Ead., *Lições de filologia portuguesa* (Lisboa: Ed. da "Revista de Portugal" [1946]).
- MIGLIORINI, B., *Pronunzia fiorentina o pronunzia romana?* Bibl. di LN, V (Firenze: Sansoni, 1945). Id., *Linguistica* (Firenze: Le Monnier, 1946). Id., *Storia della lingua italiana*, 1st and 2d ed. (Firenze: Sansoni [1960]).
- MOLL, F. DE B., *Gramática histórica catalana*. BRH, III: 5 (Madrid: Gredos, 1952).
- MONTEVERDI, A., *Manuale di avviamento agli studi romanzi: Le lingue romanze* (Milano: Francesco [1952]); outgrowth of the "dispense" *Introduzione allo studio della filologia romanza* (Roma, 1943).
- MOREL-FATIO, A., "Das Catalanische", tr. A. Horning, in Gröber, *Grundriß* . . . , I (1888), 669-688; 2d ed. (1904-06), rev. by J. Saroihandy, tr. G. Gröber and A. Horning, pp. 841-877.
- MÚGICA, P. DE [with numerous footnotes by M. de Unamuno], *Gramática del castellano antiguo*, I: *Fonética* (Berlin: Heinrich & Kemke, 1891). Id., *Dialectos castellanos* [sic]: *montañés, vizcaíno, aragonés*; I: *Fonética* (Berlin: Heinrich & Kemke, 1892).
- MUNTHE, Å. W., *Anteckningar om folkmålet i en trakt af Vestra Asturien* (Diss. Uppsala, 1887).
- MUSSAFIA, A., (†1905) *Italienische Sprachlehre in Regeln und Beispielen, für den ersten Unterricht bearbeitet*, 5th ed. (Wien, later also Leipzig: Braumüller, 1872); 27th ed., rev. by E. Maddalena (1904); 29th ed. (1912).
- NANDRIŞ, G., "The development and structure of Rumanian", *The Slavonic and East European Review*, XXX (1951), 7-39.
- NAVARRO, T., *Métrica española; reseña histórica y descriptiva*. Syracuse University: Centro de Estudios Hispánicos (Syracuse University Press), 1956; cf. P. Le Gentil in *RPh.*, XII: 4 (1959), 1-32.
- NEBRIXA, E. A. DE, (†1522) *Gramática de la lengua castellana* (Salamanca, 1492); ed. ("reproduction phototypique") E. Walberg (Halle: Niemeyer, 1909); ed. I. González-Llubera (London, etc.: H. Milford [Oxford University Press], 1926); eds. L. Galindo Romeo and L. Ortiz Muñoz (Madrid: Ed. de la Junta del Centenario, 1946).
- NIEDERMANN, M., *Précis de phonétique historique du latin*. Foreword by A. Meillet (Paris: Klincksieck, 1906); 2d rev. ed. (1931; reprinted in 1945); 3d rev. ed. (1953); tr. E. Hermann [*Historische Lautlehre des Lateinischen*], with Foreword by J. Wackernagel (Heidelberg: Winter, 1907); 2d ed. (1911); 3d rev. ed. (1953); tr. H. A. Strong and H. Stewart [*Outlines of Latin phonetics*] (London: Routledge, 1910).
- NUNES, J. J., (†1932) *Crestomatia arcaica; excerptos da literatura portuguesa . . . acompanhados de introdução gramatical, notas e glossário* (Lisboa: Ferreira e Oliveira, 1906); 2d ed., completely revised (Lisboa: Portugal-Brasil Ltda.

- [1921]). Id., *Compêndio de gramática histórica portuguesa; fonética – morfologia* (Lisboa: Teixeira, 1919); 2d rev. ed. (1930); 3d ed. (1945); this book goes back to the author's "Fonética histórica portuguesa" [with editorial notes by J. Leite de Vasconcelos], *RL*, III (1895), 251–307.
- NYROP, K., *Grammaire historique de la langue française*, 6 vols. (Copenhagen, etc.: Nordisk Forlag, later in partnership with Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1899–1930). Vols. III–VI appeared in 1908 (*Formation des mots*), 1913 (*Sémantique*), 1925 and 1930 (*Syntaxe*), respectively; of Vol. I (*Histoire générale . . . , Phonétique*) there appeared a 2d (1904) and a 3d (1914) ed.; of Vol. II (*Morphologie*, 1903), a 2d rev. ed. (1924).
- OLIVER ASÍN, J., (*Iniciación al estudio de la*) *historia de la lengua española* (Pamplona, 1938 [Preface dated 1937]); 2d ed. (Zaragoza, 1938); 3d rev. ed. ("Heraldo de Aragón", 1939); 4th ed. (Madrid: Diana, 1940); 5th ed. and 6th ed. (1941).
- OVIDIO, F. D' [in charge of linguistics], and E. MONACI [in charge of literature], *Manualetti d'introduzione agli studi neolatini*, 2 vols.: I. *Spagnuolo* (Napoli, 1879); II. *Portoghese (e gallego)* (Imola, 1881). D'Ovidio (tr. A. Horning) and W. Meyer[-Lübke], "Die italienische Sprache", in G. Gröber, *Grundriß . . .* I (1888), 489–560 (D'Ovidio's share: Section I ["bis einschließlich der Tonvokale"]); 2d ed., rev. by Meyer-Lübke (1904–06), 637–711; tr. E. Polcari [*Grammatica storica della lingua e dei dialetti italiani*], "Manuali Hoepli" (Milano: Hoepli, 1919).
- PATON, D. A., *Manuel d'ancien français (début du XII^e siècle)*. Nelson's "Modern studies", II (London, etc.: Nelson 1933).
- PAUL, H., *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1880); 2d ed. (1886); 3d ed. (1898); 4th ed. (1909); 5th ed. (1920); tr. H. A. Strong (rev. C. H. Herford) [*Principles of the history of language*], 2d ed. (London: Sonnenschein, Lowrey & Co., 1888; New York: Macmillan, 1889); rev. ed. (1890–91); adapt. H. A. Strong, W. S. Logemann, and B. I. Wheeler [*Introduction to the study of the history of language*] (London-New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1891).
- PEI, M. A., *The Italian language* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1941); rev. by R. A. Hall, Jr. in *Lang.*, XVII (1941), 263–269; author's *Reply* privately published, distributed in 1946 (copy in New York Public Library); cf. also B. Terracini in *RFH*, V (1943), 276–287.
- PELLEGRINI, G. B., *Grammatica storica spagnuola*. Collana di grammatiche storiche neolatine, ed. C. Battisti, II (Bari: "Leonardo da Vinci", 1950).
- PICHON, É., *L'enrichissement lexical dans le français d'aujourd'hui; les principes de la suffixation en français*. Bibliothèque du "Français Moderne" (Paris: d'Artrey, 1942).
- POPE, M. K., *From Latin to Modern French with especial consideration of Anglo-Norman; phonology and morphology* (Manchester: University Press, 1934); 2d ed., rev. by T. B. W. Reid and R. C. Johnston (1952).
- POTTIER, B., *Introduction à l'étude de la philologie hispanique*, 2 vols. [I: Généralités et phonétique espagnole; II: Morphosyntaxe espagnole – étude structurale] ([Bordeaux] 1957–58); 2d ed. (Paris, 1960).

- PUȘCARIU, S., and E. HERZOG, *Lehrbuch der rumänischen Sprache*, I: *Anfangsgründe* (Czernowitz, 1919); 2d rev. ed. (1920).
- QUADRI, B., *Aufgaben und Methoden der onomasiologischen Forschung; eine entwicklungsgeschichtliche Darstellung*. RH, XXXVI (Bern: Francke, 1952).
- REGULA, M., *Historische Grammatik des Französischen*, 2 vols. [I: Lautlehre; II: Formenlehre] (Heidelberg: Winter, 1955[-56]).
- REINHARDSTOETTNER, C. VON, *Grammatik der portugiesischen Sprache auf Grundlage des Lateinischen und der romanischen Sprachvergleichung bearbeitet* (Straßburg-London: Trübner, 1878).
- REMACLE, L., *Le problème de l'ancien wallon*. BPhLUL, CIX (Liège, 1948).
- RHEINFELDER, H., *Altfranzösische Grammatik*, I: *Lautlehre* (München: Hueber, 1937); 2d rev. ed. (1953-55).
- RICHTER, E., "Der innere Zusammenhang in der Entwicklung der romanischen Sprachen" [completed in March, 1910], in *Prinzipienfragen der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Festschrift Meyer-Lübke), II, ZRPh., Memoir XXVII (Halle a.S.: Niemeyer, 1911), pp. 57-143. Ead., *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Romanismen*, I: *Chronologische Phonetik des Französischen bis zum Ende des 8. Jahrhunderts*, ZRPh., Memoir LXXXII (Halle, 1934); cf. E. Gamillscheg in ZFSL, LXI (1937), 89-106 (included in the reviewer's *Ausgewählte Aufsätze* . . . , ZFSL, Suppl. XV [Jena-Leipzig: Gronau, 1937], pp. 25-42).
- ROHLFS, G., *Le gascon; études de philologie pyrénéenne*, ZRPh., Memoir LXXXV (Halle: Niemeyer, 1935). Id., *Historische Grammatik der italienischen Sprache und ihrer Mundarten*, 3 vols. [I: Lautlehre; II: Formenlehre und Syntax, erster Teil; III: Syntax [zweiter Teil] und Wortbildung; Register]. Bibl. Rom. I: 5-7 (Bern: Francke, 1949 [-54]; entire text written 1943-46). Id., "Das spanische Suffix *-arrón* und Verwandtes", ASNS, CLXXXII (1943), 118-122. Cf. under C. Voretzsch.
- RONJAT, J., (†1925) *Grammaire [h]istorique des parlers provençaux modernes*, 3 vols. [I: Introduction, phonétique: voyelles et diphtongues; II: Phonétique: consonnes et phénomènes généraux; III: Morphologie et formation des mots; notes de syntaxe], ed. W. von Wartburg (Montpellier: Société des langues romanes, 1930-37).
- SÁNCHEZ SEVILLA, P., (†) "El habla de Cespedosa de Tormes (en el límite de Salamanca y Ávila)", RFE, XV (1928), 131-172, 244-282.
- SANCHIS GUARNER, M., "Noticia del habla de Aguaviva de Aragón", RFE, XXXIII (1949), 15-65.
- SANDFELD(-JENSEN), K., *Sprogvidenskaben; en kortfattet fremstilling af dens metoder og resultater* (København & Kristiania: Gyldendal, 1913-14); 2d ed. (1923); tr. and abridgment [*Die Sprachwissenschaft*], "Aus Natur und Geisteswelt", CDLXXII (Leipzig-Berlin: Teubner, 1915); new printing (1923). Id., *Balkanfilologien; en oversigt over dens resultater og problemer* (København: Lunos, 1926); tr. [*Linguistique balkanique; problèmes et résultats*], SLP, Collection linguistique, XXXI (Paris: Champion, 1930). Cf. L. Hjelmslev in AcL, IV (1944), 136-139.
- SARMIENTO, Pe M., "Elementos etimológicos según el método de Euclides"

- [1758–66], in "Escritos filológicos", ed. J. P., *BRAE*, XV (1928), 670–684; XVI (1929), 244–255, 366–382; XVII (1930), 275–290, 571–592, 721–742; XVIII (1931), 118–135.
- SAROIHANDY, J., "Remarques sur la phonétique du *ç* et du *z* en ancien espagnol", *BHi*, IV (1902), 198–214.
- SAVJ-LOPEZ, P., (†1919) *Le origini neolatine*, ed. [and final chapter] P. E. Guarnerio. "Manuali Hoepli" (Milano: Hoepli, 1920); tr. P. Sánchez Sarto [*Orígenes neolatinos*] (Barcelona, etc.: Labor, 1935).
- SCHUCHARDT, H., *Der Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins*, 3 vols. (I: Einleitung, Qualitative Vokalveränderung [A]; II: Qualitative [B], Quantitative Vokalveränderung; III: Nachträge und Register) (Leipzig: Teubner, 1866–68).
- SCHUCHHARDT, H., *Beiträge zur Geschichte der italienischen Scheidewörter*. BBRPh., VI: 3 (Jena-Leipzig: Gronau [Agricola], 1936).
- SCHULTZ-GORA, O., *Altprovenzalisches Elementarbuch*. SRE, I: 3 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1906); 2d ed. (1911); 3d rev. ed. (1915); 4th rev. ed. (1924).
- SCHWAN, E., (†1893) *Grammatik des Altfranzösischen; Laut- und Formenlehre* (Leipzig: Reisland, 1888); 2d rev. ed. (1893). All subsequent editions were revised by D. Behrens (†1929): 3d (1898), 4th (1899), 5th (1901), 6th (1903), 7th (1907), 8th (1909), 9th ed. (1911), 10th (1913–14), 11th (1919), 12th (1925). Tr. O. Bloch, with Preface by F. Brunot [*Grammaire de l'ancien français*] (Leipzig: Reisland, 1900; after German 4th); 2d ed., 2 vols. in 1 (1913, after German 9th); 3d ed. (1923, after German 11th); 4th ed. (1932, after German 12th). The "Materialien zur Einführung in das Studium der altfranzösischen Mundarten" appeared first in the 8th ed., became a section separately paged – and sometimes even bound – in 1913 at the latest (3d ed., 1921, frequently bound with the 11th ed. of *Grammatik*).
- ŠIŠMARĚV, V., *Ůčerki po istorii jazykův Ispánii*. Romano-Germanica, V, Institut jazyká i myšlenija ... (Moskvá-Leningrád: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Naúk, 1941), cf. Y. Malkiel in *Lang.*, XX (1944), 155–160. Id., *Istoričeskaja morfológija francúzskogo jazyká* (Moskvá: Akademija Naúk [Institut Jazykoznánija], 1952). Id., *Kníga dlja čténija po istorii francúzskogo jazyká* and, with M. A. Borodiná and M. V. Górdina, *Slovár' starofrancúzskogo jazyká, k Kníge ...* (Moskvá: Akademija Naúk [Institut Jazykoznánija], 1955).
- SOMMER, F., *Lateinische Schulgrammatik mit sprachwissenschaftlichen Anmerkungen* (Frankfurt a.M.: Diesterweg, 1920). Id., *Vergleichende Syntax der Schulsprachen (deutsch, englisch, französisch, griechisch, lateinisch)* (Leipzig-Berlin: Teubner, 1921).
- SPAULDING, R. K., *How Spanish grew* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1943).
- SPITZER, L., *Die Wortbildung als stilistisches Mittel exemplifiziert an Rabelais ...*, ZRPh., Memoir XXIX (Halle a.S.: Niemeyer, 1910). Id., "Die epizönen Nomina auf -a(s) in den iberischen Sprachen" (pp. 82–182), in "Über Ausbildung von Gegensinn in der Wortbildung" (pp. 81–230), see Gamillscheg and Spitzer, *Beiträge zur romanischen Wortbildungslehre*, BAR, II: 2 (Genève: Olschki, 1921).

- STAAFF, E., *Étude sur l'ancien dialecte léonais d'après des chartes du XIII^e siècle* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, and Leipzig: Haupt, 1907 ["Étude grammaticale": pp. 171-347]); cf. R. Menéndez Pidal in *RDR*, II (1910), 119-130.
- STEIGER, A., *Contribución a la fonética del hispano-árabe y de los arabismos en el ibero-románico y el siciliano*, *RFE*, Suppl. XVII (Madrid, 1932).
- STOLZ, F., (†1915) and J. H. Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*, 5th ed., rev. by M. Leumann and J. B. Hofmann, in *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. W. Otto, II: 2 (München: Beck, 1928 [orig. ed.: 1885; 4th ed.: 1910]).
- STURTEVANT, E. H., *Linguistic change; an introduction to the historical study of language* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1917). Id., *Hittite glossary; words of known or conjectured meaning, with Sumerian ideograms and Accadian words common in Hittite texts*, "Language" Monograph, IX (1931); 2d ed. [*A Hittite ... Akkadian ... occurring in ...*] (Philadelphia: LSA, Spec. Publ., for Yale University, 1936). Id., *A comparative grammar of the Hittite language*, W. D. Whitney Linguistic Series (Philadelphia: LSA [for Yale University] and University of Pennsylvania, 1933); [2d] rev. ed., with E. A. Hahn (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951). Id., with G. Bechtel, *A Hittite chrestomathy* (Philadelphia: LSA for Yale University, 1935); "Index", by B. Schwartz (New York, 1937). Id., *An introduction to linguistic science* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947).
- SUCHIER, H., "Die französische und provenzalische Sprache und ihre Mundarten", in G. Gröber, *Grundriß ...*, I (1888), 561-668 and 12 small maps; 2d rev. ed. (1904-06), 712-840, tr. P. Monet ["sur le conseil de G. Paris": *Le français et le provençal*] (Paris: Bouillon, 1891 ["M. Suchier ... a modifié et amélioré nombre de passages du texte primitif : en sorte que c'est, à vrai dire, une nouvelle édition"]); tr. and adapt. C. Guerlin de Guer [*Les voyelles toniques du vieux français; langue littéraire (Normandie et Ile-de-France)*] (Paris: Champion, 1906).
- SUCHIER, W., *Französische Verslehre auf historischer Grundlage*. SKL, XIV (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1952).
- TAGLIAVINI, C., *Grammatica rumena* (Heidelberg: Groos, 1923). Id., *Rumänische Konversationsgrammatik*, Methode Gaspey-Otto-Sauer, 5th ed. ["vollständig neu bearbeitet"; actually replaces earlier Rumanian grammars in this series by R. Lovera and A. Jacob (1912; 2d ed., rev. by J. Slavici, 1919) and A. Storch (1921, 1923)] (Heidelberg: Groos, 1938). Id., *Le origini delle lingue neolatine* (lithoprinted "dispense", 1949 [outgrowth of a lecture course originally offered at Bologna, 1926-27, later at Nijmegen and Budapest]); 2d rev. ed. (Bologna: Pàtron [1952]); 3d rev. ed. [new subtitle: *Introduzione alla filologia romanza*] (1959).
- TALLGREN[-TUULIO], O. J., "Las z y ç del antiguo castellano iniciales de sílaba, estudiadas en la inédita *Gaya* de [Pero Guillén de] Segovia", *Mém. Soc. Néophil. de Helsingfors*, IV (1906), 3-50, 397-401. Id., *Estudios sobre la "Gaya" de [Pero Guillén de] Segovia; capítulos de introducción a una edición crítica* (Helsinki: Kirjapaino-Osakeyhtiö Sana, 1907), esp. Chap. VI: "Monografia fonética: Ç, Z" (pp. 78-91).

- THUMB, A., (†1915) *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*. Indog. Bibl., I: 1: 8 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1909); 2d ed., completely revised by E. Kieckers, Part I (1932).
- TIKTIN, H., "Die rumänische Sprache", in G. Gröber, *Grundriß . . .*, I (1888), 438–460; rev. ed. (1904–06), 564–607. Id., *Rumänisches Elementarbuch*. SRE, I: 6 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1905).
- TOBLER, A., (†1910) *Vom französischen Versbau alter und neuer Zeit; Zusammenstellung der Anfangsgründe* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1880); 2d ed. (1883); 4th ed. (1903); 6th ed. [new printing] (1921); tr. K. Breul and L. Sudre, based on 2d German ed., with Preface by G. Paris [*Le vers français ancien et moderne*] (Paris: Vieweg, 1885); tr. and ed. E. W. May (typescript, Univ. of Chicago M.A. thesis, 1923).
- TREND, J. B., *The language and history of Spain*. Hutchinson's University Library, Modern Languages, ed. N. B. Jopson (London: Hutchinson House, 1953).
- ULLMANN, S., *Précis de sémantique française*. Bibl. Roman., I: 9 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, and Berne: Francke [1952]); 2d rev. ed. (1959).
- ULRICH, J., *Die formelle Entwicklung des Partizipiums Präteriti in den romanischen Sprachen*, Diss. Zürich (Winterthur, 1879).
- VORETZSCH, C. [later K.], *Einführung in das Studium der altfranzösischen Sprache zum Selbstunterricht für den Anfänger*. SKL, I (Halle: Niemeyer, 1901); 2d ed. (1903); 3d ed. (1907); 4th ed. (1911); 5th ed. (1918); 6th ed. (1932). Replaced by G. Rohlf's, *Vom Vulgärlatein zum Altfranzösischen; Einführung in das Studium der altfranzösischen Sprache*. SKL, XV (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1960).
- WACKERNAGEL, J., *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*, ed. Philologisches Seminar Universität Basel (Basel: Burkhäuser, 1920); 2d ed., 2 vols. (1926–28).
- WAGNER, M. L., "Flessione nominale e verbale del sardo antico e moderno", *ID*, XIV (1938), 93–170; XV (1939), 1–29. Id., *Historische Lautlehre des Sardischen*, ZRPh., Memoir XCIII (Halle a.S.: Niemeyer, 1941). Id., *Historische Wortbildungslehre des Sardischen*. RH, XXXIX (Bern: Francke, 1952). Id., *La lingua sarda; storia, spirito e forma* [ed. G. Nencioni]. Bibl. Rom., I: 3 (Bern: Francke [1951]).
- WEINRICH, H., *Phonologische Studien zur romanischen Sprachgeschichte*. FRPh. (ed. H. Lausberg), VI (Münster i.W. [1958]); cf. K. Togeby in *RPh.*, XIII: 4 (1960), 401–413.
- WIESE, B., *Altitalienisches Elementarbuch*. SRE, I: 4 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1904); 2d rev. ed. ["völlige Neuordnung des Stoffes"] (1928).
- WIGGERS, J., *Grammatik der spanischen Sprache*, 2d ed. (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1884).
- WILLIAMS, E. B., *From Latin to Portuguese; historical phonology and morphology of the Portuguese language* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1938).
- ZAMORA VICENTE, A., *Dialectología española*. BRH, III: 8 (Madrid: Gredos [1960]).

ZAUNER, A., (†1940) *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft*. Sammlung Göschel, No. 128 (Leipzig: Göschel, 1900); 2d ed., entirely revised, 2 vols., SG, Nos. 128, 250 (1905); 3d rev. ed. (Berlin-Leipzig: Göschel, 1914); 4th ed., mere reprint ["Neudruck"] (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1944-45). Cf. under H. Lausberg, above. Id., *Altspanisches Elementarbuch*. SRE, I: 5 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1908); cf. rev. art. by F. Hanssen, "Sobre un compendio de gramática castellana anteclassica", *AUCh.*, CXXII (1908), 671-695; 2d ed., completely revised (1921).

Summary

This exploratory essay applies the typological method to the classification, not of languages, but of diachronic linguistic analyses, most of which may be subsumed under the traditional label of "historical grammar". In this pilot study the material tends to be limited to Romance, but the method, after certain adjustments, lends itself to discernibly wider application. The purpose of the inquiry is to establish a number of frequently recurrent distinctive features whose varying constellations – some of them fairly unusual or even potential rather than real – are apt to characterize, with formulaic brevity, the peculiar slant of each such diachronic study. The full bibliographic clues to those researches which have here deserved mention – not infrequently, oblique or parenthetical – have been assembled in a Supplement.

THE STUDY OF THE SO-CALLED EXOTIC LANGUAGES AND GENERAL LINGUISTICS*

Summary

The article attempts to define the role the so-called exotic languages have played in the development of general linguistics. It is argued that in the present situation especially the study of syntax needs data from exotic languages. These data however can only be gathered if the linguist will take the trouble of learning the language in question and possesses a psychologically acceptable method for working with informants.

It is a well-known fact that for a long time the study of language rested on a narrow factual basis. The Indian grammarians did not consider any other language apart from Sanscrit, whereas Greek linguistic speculation was only based on Greek speechforms. In Western Europe attention remained concentrated on the classical languages. A widening of the linguistic horizon came about in the 16th century when renewed interest arose in Hebrew and scholars started to consider a number of modern languages of Western Europe. But in spite of occasionally remarkable descriptions, and likewise in spite of incidental remarkable historical and comparative work (e.g. that of Ludolf and the Dutch scholar Ten Kate), it can hardly be denied that the last quarter of the 18th century with but few exceptions possessed not more than the most general notions of those hundreds of languages indicated nowadays by the rather vague term "exotic languages", i.e. the languages of the autochthonous inhabitants of the two Americas, the non-Semitic African languages, and the languages of South and East Asia, Indonesia and the Pacific area. The well-known compendia by Pallas, Hervas and Adelung which were compiled towards the end of the 18th and during the beginning of the 19th century are on the one hand monuments for the growing interest in foreign languages, but on the other, they bear eloquent testimony to the correctness of the preceding statement. It is certainly out of the

*) The contents of this article formed the substance of a public lecture delivered at Leiden University on 4th February 1956 and first published in Dutch in "Museum" 61 (1956) p. 65-80.

question that before 1800 the study of these exotic languages could have influenced the linguistic ideas prevalent in Western Europe at that time. It is only since the beginning of the 19th century that we observe how the non-European and non-Semitic languages, or at least some of these, begin to enter the sphere of interest of the students of language. But the interest thus shown is at first far from identical with appreciation. The preponderant 19th century accent on languages reconstruction with attention concentrated on one single family of languages, allowed the exotic languages only a very modest, Cinderella-like place. Until quite late in the 19th century they enjoyed the doubtful privilege of occupying the lowest place in the classifying surveys which were the fashion since von Schlegel. These classifications were not made according to structural types, as e.g. Finck attempted to do later, but they always contained an evaluation or sometimes clearly possessed an evolutionary character, as e.g. Schleicher's. Chinese, a language of which the drafters of these classifications had only a superficial knowledge, was considered to be the classical example of human language in its most primitive form, because the Chinese word does not permit morphological change; Chinese therefore was thought not to possess or rather: not yet to possess, a morphology. Reversely – and this will hardly come as a surprise – the Indo-European languages with their richly developed flexion, at least in their earlier stages, were considered to be the acme of linguistic development. It is only much later that this esteem for the superiority of the Indo-European group of languages disappears, although it may make itself felt up to the present, though mostly among linguistically untrained people.

However, the present outline would be very unjust if it were to give the impression that in Western Europe all students of language took such an unfavourable view of the non-European and non-Semitic idioms. Two corrections have to be applied. In the first place it has to be observed that the great majority of the scholars whose opinion on these languages was unfavourable cannot be called students of general linguistics. They were scholars who, meritorious as their work might be, became rather onesidedly engaged in the genetic study of language. As soon as they left their own field and took up the study of central linguistic problems, we find unwarranted speculation and in general a lack of considered insight. In the second place we ought to state that

those few scholars who may be duly called general linguists held opinions on the exotic languages which were quite different from those of most comparatists. In this connection we are immediately reminded of the two great general linguists of the 19th century, Wilhelm von Humboldt in the first half and Von der Gabelentz at the close of that century.

Both men had acquired a wider linguistic horizon: they had special ties with the exotic languages. Von Humboldt had arrived there through studies of his own, for it was he who gave a closer definition of the position of Ancient Javanese in the Indonesian field; at the same time he possessed knowledge of Basque and of some North-American languages. Von der Gabelentz had been led there by the work of his father Hans Conant von der Gabelentz who had earned a reputation in the field of the Melanesian languages. As early as 1828 Von Humboldt in one of his minor studies (on the Dualis) had stressed the great importance of the languages of America and Africa for general linguistics; while Von der Gabelentz by his broad view of language phenomena compares favourably even with famous Indo-Europeanists like Whitney and Hermann Paul.

The present has arrived at a truer appreciation of the linguistic works by Von Humboldt, but this is even more true for the work on general linguistics which Von der Gabelentz published towards the end of his life. Nowadays he is rightly considered as the principal forerunner of De Saussure; several of the central ideas of the Swiss linguist are already to be found in his work, like the recognition of the value of synchronic language study on a par with the historical approach.

Still, for the 19th century students of language both Von Humboldt and Von der Gabelentz were not figures of prime importance. The extent to which their true value was underestimated, even quite far into the present century, is demonstrated by a wellknown work like Pedersen's history of 19th century linguistic studies, published as late as 1924. This work is silent about Von Humboldt's contribution in the field of general linguistics, whereas the name of Von der Gabelentz is not even mentioned.

However, it would be an unfair characterization of 19th century linguistic studies if we were to stress only their concentration on the historical and comparative investigations of the Indo-European languages known at that time, and the rather rare instances of interest

in the more fundamental problems of linguistics which hardly penetrated into wider circles. For the 19th century was also the age of the large scale collection of data concerning numerous languages. If Herivas' work of 1801 was not more than a collection of versions of a Christian prayer rendered in about three hundred languages, with some grammatical notes, the scholar at the end of the century had at his disposal an impressive array of dictionaries, grammars and linguistic treatises. And although their quality is often open to criticism, some of these works have remained unsurpassed up to the present, like e.g. Kleinschmidt's admirable description of 1851 of the Eskimo language spoken in Greenland or Van der Tuuk's description of Toba-Batak (Sumatra) of 1864.

The aim of this discussion however is not an evaluation of the then already voluminous literature on the exotic languages. The point at issue is the relation which existed at that time between the general linguistic views at the centre and the study of these languages, mostly spoken in distant areas. Well, as regards this point one may say for practically the whole of the 19th century that in so far as such a relation did exist, it was onesided, viz. from the centre to the periphery. If we take the brilliant Van der Tuuk again as an example, we observe that he personally was acquainted with the principles of the still rapidly developing discipline of comparative linguistics, witness his application of this method to the Indonesian material. But conversely it can hardly be maintained that his Toba-Batak grammar, in spite of its intrinsic importance, has influenced the development of linguistic theory in Western Europe. And what is true for his descriptive work is also applicable in a similar fashion to the work of many others.

Moreover this onesided relation was sometimes interrupted where it had existed at an earlier stage. Professional students of language like Van der Tuuk and Kern (that other pioneer in the field of Indonesian linguistics and literature) were undoubtedly well acquainted with the comparative studies undertaken in Western Europe in the middle of the 19th century, but neither Van der Tuuk nor Kern continued to follow the important development of Indo-European studies after 1870, in spite of the fact that Kern did not restrict himself to linguistic description, but also undertook a great deal of comparative studies. Therefore, although his wellknown comparative study of Fijian of 1886 is of importance for Indonesian linguistics internally, so

to say, the student of non-Indonesian languages was not obliged to acquaint himself with it, as methodologically it was not quite up to date.

Another characteristic feature of the study of the exotic languages was that mainly untrained linguists were engaged in it. It was the missionaries, both Protestant and Catholic, as well as administrative officials and discoverers who during the 19th century and even long afterwards undertook the study of these languages. Evidently, following the developments in the field of linguistic studies in general was out of the question for them, for it is only in our time that the need of scientific training in linguistics has made itself felt among the missionary societies. This promoted a certain provincialism. By this I mean to say that linguistic studies split up into certain compartments with growing traditions of their own as regards description, transcription and terminology, compartments which lack regular mutual contact as well as contacts with the views prevalent in the centre of linguistic studies which during this century remains established in Western Europe and especially in Germany.

This provincialism, which in the course of the years has assumed serious proportions, is stimulated by several other circumstances. One of these is the fact that the study of a language by an investigator whose object of study differs from his mother tongue in so many respects, is an extremely heavy task, demanding so much of his forces that to maintain contact with developments elsewhere seems hardly possible. Moreover, this contact was of no great value to the linguist faced with the task of describing a non-Indo-European language unknown until then, as for his aims, which in most cases were primarily descriptive, Indo-European comparative studies had little to offer. A third circumstance which promoted provincialism and which increased the tendency to lose sight of the unity of linguistic studies, lies in the enormously increased and still increasing factual material. We are faced with the paradoxical situation that, when we neglect for a moment the essential relation between facts and their understanding, we might be inclined to say that the data increase more rapidly than the "carrying capacity" of our linguistic understanding. It seems in any case that sometimes a great deal of material has been collected in vain, without any benefit to linguistics in general. The spate of information, welcome in itself although at times slightly alarming, is

even more noticeable within the different Indo-European languages. The student of Romance languages, for instance, works in an ever widening field, whereas the constantly swelling stream of publications increases the temptation for him to restrict himself to his own linguistic sector, already large enough as it is. To demand that the investigator continue to take notice of more general theoretical views, let alone to weigh these critically or to contribute to their development, is to demand a great deal. In the present situation it is exceptional to find a specialist in the Germanic languages well-informed on developments in a relatively nearby field of studies like e.g. that of Slavic studies. This need not be a cause for astonishment when we realise that the number of linguistic publications for the whole world in the middle of the present century is to be put at about five to six thousand annually. Nevertheless, keeping contact with the development of our general conception of language is a vital necessity for each and every linguist.

The science of linguistics – using the term in the sense in which Schuchardt wished to see it applied, viz. without either the prefix “general” or some geographical restriction – can only arrive at deeper insight both into linguistic phenomena in general and into some specific language in particular, when there exists a firm contact and a constant interaction between general theory and concrete research into a specific language. The correctness of this view will become clear, when we discuss the development of Amerindian linguistics during the last decades.

However, before we enter into this matter a few brief remarks remain to be made about 20th century linguistics. If it was easy to characterize 19th century studies due to their rather rectilinear development, it is much more difficult to do so for the 20th century with its strongly diverging tendencies, and all the more so because historical studies on the recent past are practically lacking. We shall have to wait for a second Cassirer to describe the course of linguistics during the last half century, paying due attention to the philosophical background.

Still, it is a fact that at the beginning of the century the position of the rather dogmatic comparatists was weakened due to two events. One of these was the discovery of Indo-European languages like Tocharian and Hittite, for although these discoveries stimulated further research along the established lines, they also showed that

reconstructions believed to be unassailable, were less certain than had been assumed. The second event had to do with the study of the exotic languages, and especially with the study of the North American Indian languages, where problems arose which could not be directly dealt with by applying the insights gained by the historical comparative method.

A number of reactions against the solid structure of Indo-European comparative studies are also to be observed. These are exemplified in dialect-geography which brought again to the fore the spatial factor, neglected by comparative studies. The same applies to neo-philologists like Vossler, and later Spitzer, who showed a renewed interest in the likewise neglected factor of individual creation. A survey of the new developments in linguistic studies moreover cannot overlook the changes which took place in the field of psychology. The unsuccessful attempts by Herman Paul and others to gain insight into the phenomena of linguistic change by means of Herbert's associative psychology led some scholars to resist all interference in the field of linguistics from the side of psychology. Others, however, tried to use the new achievements of "Gestalt"-psychology and of behaviorism for the benefit of linguistic studies.

The most important development of the present century has undoubtedly proved to be the emergence of structural and functional principles, which were introduced into linguistics in Western Europe by De Saussure, in Eastern Europe by Baudouin de Courtenay and in America by Sapir. Here the influence of the French sociologist Durkheim and especially of Husserl's phenomenology is undeniable. Structuralism and functionalism are far from being specific developments within the field of language studies; they have made themselves felt in many branches of learning, e.g. biology. Interest was focused on the relations between the elements, or, in other words, on patterns. This implied first and foremost the rejection of the historical comparison of elements, and the rehabilitation of synchronic description, a procedure which Paul still called a regrettably necessary pre-scientific first step towards "real," i.e. historical, research. It likewise implied a renewed interest in general linguistic problems, and there is probably no period in which more works appeared devoted to general problems than the decades between 1920 and 1950. It soon became apparent that, due to the work of the Prague school, the interest in language patterns led to new insights in the sound aspect of language,

at a moment when experimental phonetics had turned away from linguistics and had developed into a direction which did not seem to offer much to the linguist. Nevertheless, it should be stated that for the study of language-elements in their mutual relation the first steps still remained to be taken. It was a of little use that it was possible to trace the development of a certain linguistic element for a certain period; the problem had now become, how a certain linguistic fact functioned within the pattern of the language. The quest for origins had been replaced by the quest for functions.

Now, what were the consequences for the study of the exotic languages of the newly gained insights briefly indicated above? Extremely few for most of them, in the beginning. If we look, for instance, at Indonesian language studies before the second world war, there is actually nothing to indicate that tumultuous changes were taking place in the science of linguistics, for no arresting changes have occurred here in methods of description, although Bloomfield's description of Tagalog, published as early as 1917, might have provided an impulse. The manner in which the historical-comparative method was handled here, mainly by Brandstetter and Dempwolff, was in spite of its merits no more than a faithful imitation of the methods we saw used in Europe since the eighteen seventies.

In one field, however, the situation was different, viz. in the field of the North American languages, because it was here that by way of exception the onesided relation between general linguistics and the study of the exotic languages had been transformed into a reciprocal one. This was in the first place due to the fact that a number of eminent scholars had taken up the study of these languages, men like Boas and in this country C. C. Uhlenbeck, and somewhat later Sapir and Bloomfield. Moreover, these scholars, except Boas who was originally a geographer, were fully at home in the Indo-European field. Among them, Sapir (whom I consider to have been the most brilliant of all) and Bloomfield have acquired a following in the United States. The extent to which this contact with prominent Indo-European scholars has been profitable to the historical comparative studies of the North American languages becomes clear when we observe the numerous new classifications of these languages suggested i.a. by Sapir and Kroeber, after the first attempt by Powell in 1891. Their aim was, although I am not quite in a position to judge its importance, to go

beyond mere imitation of the classical comparative method. The present situation is that where Powell (whose classification was nowhere proved to be incorrect) still accepted fiftyfive language families without any demonstrable genetic relation, Trager believes it possible to arrive at a reduction to six, or perhaps seven, larger groups. And although much of this is quite uncertain, as Hoijer recently stressed, and although a great deal of study will still be needed to transform present suppositions into certainties or to unmask idle speculations, yet here we undoubtedly find an intimate relation between a general linguistic approach and comparative studies, a relation which has evidently borne fruit. The remarks made here for comparative studies hold good even to a larger extent for descriptive studies, as is shown by the periodical devoted to the study of the American Indian languages founded by Boas in 1917, the *International Journal of American Linguistics*. It is far from exceptional that this journal publishes articles which are of particular importance for general linguistics, like the studies by Swadesh and Pike, and important reviews of general works, like Householder's discussion of Zellig Harris's handbook of structural methods in linguistics.

The description of American Indian languages also owes much to the enormous development of linguistic studies in the United States since the beginning of the second world war, a development which in a short space of time made the United States the centre of these studies. The cause for this rapid growth was first and foremost the military necessity to acquire at short notice personnel able to speak and understand Japanese, Chinese, Korean and other languages. Now the study of foreign languages had been but little developed before the war, and Americans were often believed to be unsuited for learning alien idioms. However, once Bloomfield and a number of other scholars had made it plausible that with their linguistic insight they would be able to design effective methods for the rapid learning of languages, and once the Army and the Navy had been successful with the intensive language courses, partly established in accordance with their views, linguistic studies in the United States had received an important stimulus for further development. In this way within the framework of the so-called Army Specialized Training Program alone, Far Eastern languages were taught to two to three thousand young Americans, especially selected for this purpose. Handbooks, sometimes

of excellent quality, were published for about forty different languages. Several of these often gifted students were later able to devote themselves to language studies.

The number of professional linguists also increased due to immigration from Europe, including prominent scholars like Jakobson, Lotz and Martinet. In this way a situation was created in the field of linguistic studies similar to that prevailing in the domain of physics: European experience combined with youthful American "drive" and energy, enabling a richly varied scientific life to arise within a short period.

To future linguists the languages of North America due to their great variety offered moreover an excellent material for gaining experience in language description. Divergent approaches to language description were developed, as may be seen from the collection of outline grammars written by prominent linguists like Bloomfield, Swadesh, Voegelin, Haas e.o. (*Linguistic Structures of America*, ed. Hoijer, 1946).

It is beyond doubt that the study of these languages also exerted an influence on general linguistics. The contact with these language structures, so strongly divergent – in greatly different ways – from those pertaining in the languages of Western Europe, brought about a much needed broadening of linguistic insight; this was especially true for the views on morphology, but it also holds good for phonemics.

The present situation may be briefly characterized as follows: The students of linguistics are far from constituting a unity, for there are groups that are comparatively independent, with traditions of their own, groups where newly won insights penetrate only with difficulty, groups which from their side contribute only little to the development of general linguistic views. Over against these groups there is the centre of linguistic studies, situated in the United States and maintaining contacts with rather small groups of scholars abroad, these latter working in the Scandinavian countries and the smaller European countries, more than in Germany, the previous centre of linguistics. The languages to which these newly gained insights are applied and which, in the course of the application of these, again contribute new points of view, are several North American languages and English, as well as incidentally several other languages, in those cases where due to various circumstances, the persons engaged in the study of these

languages have come into contact with the centre. However, the unity of linguistic studies, already passionately advocated by Schuchardt, that is in our terminology: the fruitful reciprocity between general theoretical insights and the study of each of the individual languages, still remains an ideal which is realized only incidentally and only as regards certain problems, as was clearly stated by Martinet a few years ago.

This being the present situation, I would like to attempt to answer the question, what is to be expected of the continued study of the exotic languages. In order to be able to do so, a brief characterization of to-day's linguistic views seems necessary.

When we reintroduce the traditional terms of phonology, morphology and syntax, the situation may be described as follows. As stated above, the greatest progress since 1925 has been made in the field of phonology. The introduction of phonological principles has led to a realization of the manner in which the speech-sounds constitute an intrinsic part of language. Now that our increased insight in acoustics has enabled us to shift our research further towards the problem of perception, I am quite convinced that within a few decades we shall be able to penetrate more deeply into the structure and the laws of the sound-systems. A very attractive approach proved to be the analysis of phonemes, i.e. of the characteristic moments of the word-shape, into even smaller particles, viz. those acoustic qualities which in different combinations are assumed to constitute the phonemes. If Jakobson were to be proved to be right, only fifteen different distinctive features would exist in the existing languages. If this becomes true, we would have a satisfactory explanation both of the variety of the existing sound systems and of the equally undeniable striking resemblance between the corresponding phonemes in different systems.

As regards morphology, progress has been far less spectacular. Without a sufficient realization of the particular nature of the problems of morphology, certain insights acquired in the field of phonology have been extrapolated too rashly, with the result that the difficult semantical problems inherent in morphology has not yet found a satisfactory solution. Not enough attention was paid for instance to the nature of categorial meaning and its relation to lexical meaning. If I am right, these problems have not come much nearer to their solution than in the nineteen-thirties. Nevertheless, also for morphological studies an

important advance is possible, even without the addition of new theoretical insights. In this respect I may refer to the binary principle which is also important in neurology and which was introduced in linguistics by Jakobson and Karcevsky.

One of the tasks of the immediate future will be the enquiry to what extent this principle is valid for every morphology.

Finally, we come to syntax. For those languages on which syntactical studies are published, i.e. mostly a number of European languages, little progress seems to be made when compared with the other fields, at least in so far as I am able to judge by the publications I have seen. The causes for this are easily indicated. In the first place the study of syntax has started late, but another cause is even more important. There exists no other sector of the structure of language where the linguist finds himself more strongly tied to notions derived from traditional logic, and that means: a-linguistic notions. These constitute a handicap for a purely linguistic observation of syntactical phenomena, i.e. of the possibilities and the means of combining words to form groups. In this way we observe central terms like subject, predicate and object being used in comparatively excellent works like Kruisinga and Erades' English grammar without any attempt at an exact definition of these terms. As Miss Siertsema has shown, these terms are even held to be indefinable, but they are used nevertheless, and without any hesitation.

But there is still another serious difficulty, and this concerns the study of intonation, a field which is closely connected with syntax. To us the phenomena of intonation appear to be the most complicated part of language, for here we are confronted with a mixture of functions of a diverging nature, of partly arbitrary and partly non-arbitrary sound-patterns, and of the latter we even know the constituent elements incompletely. It is, moreover, extremely difficult to isolate and to describe these patterns. In spite of the increased interest paid to this aspect of language, we have to admit that progress in this branch of research is still very modest, and that we have hardly arrived at a stage where we can formulate our problems clearly. That this statement is not meant to be derogatory to the achievements attained during the recent past by Pike, Jassem and Bolinger, especially in the field of English intonation, will be evident to anybody who realizes the scope of these problems. There is still a great lack of data, and many

careful experiments starting from acceptable hypotheses concerning the limitations of the auditory organ are needed, providing a working program for many years.

Still, there are also reasons why we may expect progress in the field of syntax, though at a much slower rate than in the domains of phonology and morphology, for recently promising attempts are being made to arrive at less biased observations by means of a set of more correct concepts. One of these attempts is to be seen in the work of the gifted American linguist Paul Garvin, who recently has tried to give a syntactical analysis of a short text in Ponape, a Micronesian language spoken in the Eastern part of the Carolines. His analysis of the possible relations between consecutive words by means of the four distinctions: mutually dependent, bilaterally dependent, unilaterally dependent, and mutually tolerant, seem to me to be valid for a very wide linguistic area. Partly under other names these terms are also to be found already in that mine of linguistic insight: Reichling's work on the word.

In the foregoing I have outlined the present situation in those fields of linguistic research which concern us to-day. From this it may be observed that particularly in syntactic studies it is highly necessary that their starting-points should be corrected. But linguistic studies always need more than this, for as an empirical science they need extensive data. In the same way it is also highly necessary that syntactic studies, once these have been provided with bases that are more purely linguistic, proceed to apply these to various syntactical data. Only by doing this will they be able to develop and to undergo the necessary correction. One of the most important tasks will be to separate the essential from the contingent, and for this purpose investigations of divergent structures are the only means.

In this respect it is quite striking that in the extant descriptions of exotic languages – again, in as far as I can judge by the publications I have seen during recent years – a syntax, i.e. a theory for the connection of words and a theory for the word-groups, is usually lacking. Often their place is taken by a number of texts with translations, so that it is left to the reader to isolate the syntactical data. Even in a generally excellent example of modern American language description like Stanley Newmans's grammar of Yokuts (an Indian language of Southern Central California) we look in vain for a syntax in this sense.

This lack is far from incidental: it indicates the existence of a deadlock which will have to be overcome.

In order to explain this deadlock I shall have to enter more deeply into the nature of syntactical research, and subsequently more especially into the current methods of investigation of the exotic languages, in particular of the numerous American Indian languages.

To determine whether, according to Garvin's terminology, two words can only occur in a certain sequence due to each other's presence, or whether they tolerate each other without the presence of the one being the requisite condition for the occurrence of the other, or, again, whether a word shows a unilateral or a bilateral relation with the preceding word or the surrounding words – presupposes an intimate acquaintance with the language in question. Such subtle determinations can only be made by a student who already knows the language he studies in a way which is quite different from scholarly knowledge. In other words what is needed here is knowledge at the level of the practical use of the language. It is only of our first language that we possess this type of practical knowledge. And so I hold it to be impossible in principle that e.g. a Dutch student could ever arrive at a satisfactory syntax of English independently, i.e. without the help of English informants. No reading of texts, no acquired capacity of so-called fluent speech enables one to perform the sensitive probing for what is mutually exclusive and what is syntactically tolerated, etc., of which the linguist is capable regarding his mother tongue. For syntactical studies in exotic languages this constitutes a problem, because the student of these languages hardly ever possesses this type of knowledge. The only method at the disposal of the alien investigator is to use informants, speakers of the language, in his research, and to try by means of a special questioning technique to mobilize their practical knowledge which is so essential to him, and to transfer this knowledge to him.

It will be clear that, although informants have long been used in the study of exotic languages, the present aim is not the usual one of obtaining texts from them and assistance in the interpretation of these texts; the method of investigation envisaged by us ought to be completely different. However, it is regrettable that in this respect the experience gained in the study of the American Indian languages during the last twenty years are of no great help, due to the procedures

generally followed. For usually the linguist, assisted by an informant, during a brief period usually not exceeding a few months, collects as much material as may be considered representative for the language. Of this material the linguist provides a more or less formal analysis, the help of the informant being restricted to the interpretation of the recorded texts. This means that, after having taken down the material with the help of the traditional labels of articulatory phonetics, the linguist analyses his material in *utterances*, i.e. sound sequences surrounded by pauses. This analysis is two-fold, for at first the sounds are grouped in phonemes based on their distribution, and next the material is analysed in morphemes, viz. the smallest meaningful soundunits. In this way, two descriptive chapters are built up: phonemics and morphemics. This analytical method, to a certain extent introduced by Bloomfield and further developed and formalized i.a. by Harris, is influenced by a type of behaviorism which has been discarded in psychology long ago. It starts from the idea that meaning is not susceptible of objective description, or at least not yet so, at the present stage of linguistic description. Some linguists like Trager even go so far as to place the phenomena of meaning outside the domain of language and so, for example, determine a word merely as a certain sequence of sounds; to them the word is equal to what we in this country call the wordform. However, in actual practice much sensible water is poured into this questionable theoretical wine. Moreover, since 1949 a certain modification of these views is to be observed, due to the influence of scholars like Jakobson and Lotz. Still, it is no wonder that the description of the phenomena of meaning has not attained the status to which it is entitled, and that the theoretical climate, so to say, is but slowly becoming more favourable for the flowering of syntactical descriptions.

Closely connected with the foregoing is the fact that the investigator often is not able to use the language he describes. For the analysis as outlined above this is also less necessary. It should not be forgotten either that there are hundreds of North American languages, many of them becoming extinct more or less rapidly. Learning a language and applying the methods which I am about to advocate demands years of careful study, and it is understandable that a method which quickly leads to certain results is to be preferred under the circumstances. Nevertheless, the consequences of its application have to be pointed out.

It will be evident that the investigator who hardly knows the language practically, cannot possibly obtain a clear idea of its semantics, for the semantic data only reach him through the intermediary of the informant. The latter is burdened with the heavy task of having to translate everything into a language which he is far from having fully mastered. Moreover, the linguist is not in a position to check this process of translation and he is without means to judge the practical knowledge of the informant, let alone to activate it or to direct it. If in addition the fact is taken into account that the semantic units usually differ considerably from the units to which the investigator is accustomed, which means that often differentiations within one semantic unit in the one language are completely separate units of meaning in the other, it is clear that here the conditions are lacking for a description of the facts from within.

By now the deadlock of syntactical studies has become clear. In those cases where linguists investigate their own language, a lack of correct linguistic insight forms an obstacle. Where research is directed towards languages foreign to the linguist, syntactic study is hampered in addition by a method which does not or not sufficiently make use of the informant's practical knowledge of his language.

The only way to break this deadlock will be to develop a method capable of overcoming the fundamental difficulty which consists in the duality of speaker and student. This leads us into unknown territory, for as far as I know such a working method has not been developed. The useful hints provided by Bloomfield in his *Outline guide to the practical study of foreign languages*, further elaborated in Nida's handbook for missionaries, are altogether insufficient in this respect.

I would like to propound the thesis that linguistic studies need the support of the psychology of language, for a method of research will only be developed when we have come to understand the relationship between a member of a speech-community and his language. Quite apart from various social distinctions, this relationship varies, not only because it differs from one speaker to another, but also because this relation does not remain constant during the contact between the informant and the investigator. For it is unavoidable that the informant, faced with the unusual task of reflecting on the way in which he uses his own language and of forming a clear idea of its usage, leaves the level of consciousness of the normal use of language, a use

which is normally hardly or vaguely conscious. If the investigator does not direct this process and if he does not constantly take the informant back to concrete cases of usage, i.e. to the manner in which one proceeds normally when speaking, the chances are that the informant will start to provide preposterous explanations of his own. It is, however, of interest to observe that even these primitive reflections cannot be simply put aside, because as fruits of the first ponderings on language they may prove to have a certain value at a later stage of the research.

But we should not overlook the individual differences between informants. Everybody who starts working with informants experiences the same – linguistically naïve – disappointment when he finds that a construction which is quite usual for the one sounds strange or even impossible to the other informant. The investigator will have to realize that, quite apart from a-linguistic factors which may operate here, the attitude towards language is quite different for individual speakers. The conservative or, perhaps more exactly, the diffident personality will cling strictly to what he has heard or to what he is accustomed to use personally, whereas the more independent speaker who uses his language consciously will present to the investigator as an actual linguistic fact expressions which he feels that his language might form if necessary. Where one informant's fertile imagination allows him to create certain situations and to imagine the utterances fitting these situations as actual cases of linguistic usage, another will lack this faculty completely and so he will illustrate certain forms of language by means of sentences which it is hard to believe ever occur in reality. This means that the investigator besides being a linguist will also have to be a psychologist, who will have to know his informant very well and who will have to decide on his working method based on this knowledge.

This allows us to draw three conclusions, viz., firstly, that an prolonged contact with the informant is indispensable, preferably a contact extending over several years; secondly, that the linguist must not restrict himself to only one informant; and thirdly, that the linguist should converse with the informant without using an intermediary language. Only when these three methodological demands are satisfied, demands of which I fully realize that they will be only rarely fulfilled, researches into languages which are not the investi-

gator's mother-tongue can produce results which may be of importance also for the development of general linguistic theory.

Although the desiderata discussed above constitute essential conditions for an investigation by means of informants, nothing has been said about the method itself. But a discussion of the latter would lead us outside the framework of the present article. Suffice it to say that a technique of the linguistic interview will have to be developed, which might conceivably profit from the experiences acquired in similar types of investigation in other fields of study.

The foregoing discussion allows us to draw some conclusions. It has been shown that the question concerning the importance of the study of the exotic languages for the development of general linguistic theory cannot be answered in a way which is equally valid for all fields of linguistic structure. It would seem that a study of the exotic languages is for the time being not an imperative necessity for a further knowledge of the phonemic systems, in view of all the information that has already been collected. Matters are different as regards morphology. For the semantical description of the morphological categories and of all related problems the material is still insufficient and this limits our understanding. But for the extension of our syntactical knowledge, the study of the exotic languages is simply indispensable. In order to make this extension possible, we need a more sharply critical evaluation of the theoretical foundations of syntactic study. When the investigator is going to undertake syntactical studies of other languages than his own, he will, moreover, only be able to work in the interest of general linguistic theory when he possesses a method for the interrogation of informants which is valid from the standpoint of linguistic psychology.

Leiden

E. M. UHLENBECK

REVIEWS — COMPTES-RENDUS

GÉRARD MOIGNET, *Essai sur le mode subjonctif en latin post-classique et en ancien français*. (Publications de la faculté des lettres et sciences humaines d'Alger XXXII), Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 2 vol. 1959, 756 pages.

Cette importante thèse constitue un exposé fondamental du problème du subjonctif français, et elle apporte à ce problème, dans ses implications diachroniques et dans le synchronisme des états anciens de la langue, une solution séduisante, complexe, dont les termes, pour l'essentiel, sont empruntés aux travaux de G. Guillaume.

Elle saisit l'ensemble des données au niveau de deux coupes chronologiques: selon l'état des modalités syntaxiques dans l'usage latin tardif antérieur à la "Renaissance carolingienne", et dans le français des XII^e-XIII^e s. Entre ces deux époques linguistiques s'insèrent les documents français archaïques (IX^e-XI^e s.), qui sont moins peut-être les témoins d'une transition, qu'ils n'éclairent indirectement les mécanismes mentaux des sujets écrivant le latin de très basse époque. Au reste, il apparaît de plus en plus, depuis un certain nombre d'années, que les siècles situés entre les premiers documents de la langue galloromane, et l'émergence des traditions littéraires vers l'an 1100, forment dans l'histoire de la langue une étape *sui generis*, échappant à beaucoup des définitions valables pour les XII^e et XIII^e s.

Le choix chronologique opéré ainsi par M. Moignet, et quoique son livre ne soit pas conçu comme un ouvrage d'histoire proprement dit, éclaire singulièrement la genèse de la syntaxe romane.

L'idée de base a été inspirée par l'enseignement de Guillaume, à propos duquel l'auteur n'hésite pas à écrire (p. 77) que *Temps et verbe*, de 1929, a entièrement renouvelé les perspectives de l'analyse syntaxique. Le système verbal, dans la pensée de Guillaume, on le sait, correspond à la représentation du temps, et aux différences dans la manière dont le temps est conçu. On rejoint ici par un biais les oppositions traditionnelles de langue et parole, langage et discours. En revanche, quoique certains traits du vocabulaire de l'auteur semblent provenir de l'école de Copenhague, la discussion des pp. 79 suiv. écarte

en somme les conclusions de Togeby dans *Structure immanente de la langue française*, arguant de l'insuffisance relative d'une théorie qui ne tient pas compte du contenu sémantique des éléments analysés.

La bibliographie, pratiquement exhaustive, est complétée par une liste du matériel original dépouillé, et dont l'ampleur n'est pas sans causer quelque stupéfaction: j'y relève plus de 80 titres d'ouvrages littéraires (mais le *Recueil général des fabliaux* de Montaiglon et Raynaud, les cinq volumes du *Roman de la Rose* dans l'édition Langlois, comptent chacun pour un seul titre dans cette énumération, et le reste va à l'avenant), plus deux recueils de chartes, assez maigres (les chartes liégeoises publiées par Wilmotte en 1888 dans la *Romania*, et l'appendice de Th. Gossen dans sa *Petite grammaire de l'ancien picard*). Cette disproportion entre les textes littéraires et les chartes n'est pas justifiée expressément. Je la comprends, pour ma part, de la manière suivante: les textes latins qui servent de base à la première étape de l'étude sont (par rapport aux schémas mentaux et sociologiques de l'époque où ils ont été rédigés) des monuments littéraires ou juridiques, en tout cas affectés d'un certain coefficient d'artifice; les textes littéraires des XII^e-XIII^e s. ont, d'une manière un peu différente, le même caractère. Le caractère en revanche de la langue des chartes du XIII^e s. est plus ambigu. Il semble donc que l'auteur ait voulu se tenir dans les perspectives d'une certaine tradition linguistique, celle que, dans son ouvrage posthume, Alexis François nomme la "langue cultivée". Je ne suis pas certain toutefois d'avoir bien compris l'intention de l'auteur sur ce point.

Du latin au français, l'auteur relève une opposition dans la manière de spatialiser le temps. Côté latin, une superposition de deux "horizons", correspondant à un double présent; côté français, horizon unique, et présent unique mais comportant deux éléments inséparables (sinon par un artifice d'analyste), générateurs dans le discours de deux "niveaux". (pp. 700 suiv.). Le passage du premier système au second se produit par une série de glissements déjà bien amorcés dans le latin du bas empire. La notion des deux niveaux permet à l'auteur de se désolidariser à la fois des deux écoles qui depuis le début du siècle se partagent les syntacticiens à propos du subjonctif: l'école "dualiste", éminemment représentée aux Pays-Bas par C. de Boer (dont la *Syntaxe* est l'objet d'une discussion assez serrée pp. 29 suiv.), et l'école unitaire,

représentée en particulier par Damourette et Pichon ainsi que, d'une manière un peu différente, par Bally.

Au reste, les questions complexes soulevées par la structure propre du subjonctif en entraînent, en chaîne, une série d'autres, relatives à la structure même de la phrase. En particulier, l'opposition des niveaux et des valorisations modales débouche sur le problème d'une opposition historique possible entre hypotaxe et parataxe. L'auteur rejette les thèses de Lerch (*Historische französische Syntax*, I, 150 suiv.) et de Bally (*Linguistique générale et linguistique française*, p. 38 suiv.) selon qui l'hypotaxe serait issue en français d'une parataxe primitive. A la base de l'explication proposé par Lerch repose l'idée *a priori* que tout subjonctif est de nature volitive. Pourtant – et sur ce point la démonstration de l'auteur paraît tout à fait convaincante, v. pp. 698 suiv. – l'examen attentif de documents tels que les Serments de Strasbourg et *l'Eulalie* atteste (même si l'on tient largement compte de leur substrat mental latin, et des procédés de démarquage adoptés par leurs auteurs) de manière incontestable l'existence d'une syntaxe de subordination originelle: le vers – *la polle non amast lo Deo menestier* – semble bien irréductible à une analyse du type de celle de Lerch. A juste titre l'auteur attire l'attention sur le fait que le caractère primitif et assez simpliste du *style littéraire* archaïque galloroman est déterminé par des contingences historiques et culturelles, mais qu'il ne constitue que très imparfaitement une image de la langue vivante: tout au plus éclaire-t-il indirectement celle-ci, comme à travers les trous du tissu stylistique (ainsi dans le vers cité). Ce point de vue me paraît d'une extrême justesse... et je le partage d'autant plus aisément que, dans un essai actuellement sous presse, je crois l'avoir, par une rencontre fortuite, étayé d'un certain nombre de preuves. L'existence d'une subordination véritable dans le galloroman dès les origines est liée à l'état de son système conjonctionnel: la réduction du système latin à un *que* à tout faire, a entraîné une valorisation des formes verbales, qui peut être l'une des origines du double niveau du subjonctif français. Dans une certaine mesure, le latin apparaît, par comparaison avec la subtilité de ce nouveau système, comme un état de langue de type sensiblement plus archaïque. Certes, d'autres l'on montré avec surabondance, l'ancien français n'en est pas encore à l'époque où le mode d'une proposition subordonnée est joué d'avance; mais il se rapproche de cet aboutissement moderne, il en est déjà plus près que de l'état latin dans

lequel l'emploi du mode relève bien davantage de la parole, du discours.

Un ouvrage d'une telle richesse répugne au résumé. Sans doute appelle-t-il des discussions nombreuses; mais celles-ci ne peuvent, honnêtement, surgir que d'un usage prolongé et d'une certaine familiarité avec la pensée de l'auteur. Cela d'autant plus que M. Moignet écarte toute considération proprement causale: il se contente de suggérer, avec une extrême prudence et sous toute réserve, dans les dernières lignes de son livre, que l'explication du glissement syntaxique latin-galloroman ne peut être recherchée dans l'action d'un substrat celtique. Comme il paraît assez douteux qu'une telle explication vienne spontanément à l'esprit d'un chercheur (la ressemblance syntaxique des langues romanes occidentales suffirait à la faire écarter), on se demande si M. Moignet ne l'avait pas formulée à un moment de son travail, puis l'a abandonnée, puis a hésité et finalement n'a pas cru devoir la passer totalement sous silence . . .

Un index très complet, et une abondante table des matières analytiques permettent une utilisation aisée.

Amsterdam

PAUL ZUMTHOR

LEOPOLD ZATOČIL, *Cato a Facetus, Pojednání a Texty. Zu den deutschen Cato- und Facetusbearbeitungen, Untersuchungen und Texte*. Opera Universitatis Masarykianae Brunensis Facultas Philosophica, 48, Brno, 1952, pp. 355. Kčs 168.

Until this new edition of Cato's sayings the student of German popular literature had to rely on Fr. Zarncke, *Der deutsche Cato* of 1852. We are grateful to Mr. L. Zatočil for a new investigation into the relationship of the various versions. He reprints the different MSS without attempting to make a standard Middle High German text as Zarncke did. For the student of Early New High German it is especially valuable that for the first time the Silesian version of Cato is printed in this edition which offers a comprehensive summary of all the questions concerning research about *Cato*.

It will be regretted that the book is written in Czech, a language unknown to the reviewer and to many students of German. But a

summary (pp. 305-327) in German makes it accessible to a larger public.

University of Amsterdam

W. SCHWARZ

H. FELDMANN, *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung der Hörprüfungsmethoden*, George Thieme Verlag, Stuttgart.

In diesem kleinen Büchlein gibt der Verfasser eine sehr komplette und übersichtliche Darstellung über die Werdungsgeschichte der heutigen Hörprüfungsmethoden. Für diejenigen die den Wert der jetzigen Techniken wirklich verstehen wollen ist diese geschichtliche Hintergrund von grosser Bedeutung.

Universität von Amsterdam

L. B. W. JONGKEES

ROBERTO FERNÁNDEZ RETAMAR, *Idea de la Estilística*. Universidad Central de Las Villas (Cuba), Departamento de Relaciones Culturales, 1958, 139 pp. 8°.

This book is the outline of a "curso libre" which the author would have given at the University of Havana in the scholastic year 1955-1956 had that institution not been closed for political reasons. Thanks to this unfortunate circumstance the Hispanic world possesses an excellent handbook. In the first chapter, "Idea de la estilística", he skillfully defines it as "the study of that which is extralogical in language", and proceeds to explain it and to compare the different theories, outlining this science of related, annexed disciplines, such as philology, rhetoric, literary criticism and the science of literature. In the second chapter he deals at length with Stylistics in language, or, "estilística sin estilo" in which he refers to Bally's work but does not follow him blindly. He reveals an acquaintance with nearly everything that has been written in recent years on the subject; he dwells at length upon Dresden's article in Neo., Oct. 1952, and Guiraud's book, which he knows in a Spanish translation by M. G. de Torres Agüero (Buenos Aires, 1956). Just as the latter, he studies the relation between

stylistics and phonetics, morphology, semantics and syntax. In the following chapter he turns to "Stylistics of speech or of style" and summarizes clearly what has been produced since the turn of the century by the illustrious men who are still our masters! The late Vossler, Spitzer, Hatzfeld have all applied themselves rigorously to the study of Spanish literature. The Spaniards, although they have undergone the influence of Munich school, do not lose their well-known originality. The father and instigator is the tireless master, Don Ramón Menéndez Pidal. His spiritual children include the recently deceased Mexican Alfonso Reyes, and the untimely deceased Pedro Salinas and Amado Alonso, the poet-professor Dámaso Alonso and his talented disciple Carlos Bousoño. The general bibliography at the end of the book will be a valuable aid to scholars in this branch of the science of language.

Santpoort

J. A. VAN PRAAG

JOSÉ ROCA PONS, *Estudios sobre perifrasis verbales del español*.
Rev. de Fil, Esp., Anejo LXVII, Madrid, 1958.

In this impressive treatise, the author studies verbal periphrases in Spanish but limits himself in general to those whose object is the expression of a condition, thus excluding the ones—more interesting for a foreigner—which convey an idea of movement. The book opens with a long, well-balanced introduction on the concept of the verbal periphrase, the auxiliary verb, voice, mood, tense, and aspect (in which the latter differs in a narrow sense from the "modo de acción".) He classifies periphrases (with a participle, with a gerund, with an infinitive) and minutely analyses those with a participle in particular. For the use of "tener" he uses as his main guide Eva Seifert's work; for that of "ser" and "estar", that of Cirot and Matthies whose examples he quotes verbatim. Nevertheless he is acquainted with most of the rest of the literature on this particular matter.

In my opinion there are two objections that could be raised against this book—which is unquestionably an indispensable handbook for the Hispanist: there are few examples in some sections, and these are a mixture of medieval and modern Spanish.

Santpoort

J. A. VAN PRAAG

G. HERZIG, *Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Mundart der Auvergne (vergleichende Darstellung des gegenwärtigen Lautstandes dreier Orte: Vertaizon, Picherande, Bégut-les-Vabres)*; No 8 des *Forschungen zur romanischen Philologie*, publiées par H. Lausberg, Münster, Aschendorffscher Verlag, 1959, 139 pages.

Le titre indique les limites que s'est tracées l'auteur. Le matériel élaboré dans cette étude est original, et provient des relevés de Herzig : faits d'ordre phonétique, éléments lexicaux (présentés dans un glossaire étymologique), contes et chansons locaux. D'un point de vue méthodologique ce travail se situe à mi-chemin entre ce que l'on est convenu d'appeler études locales et études régionales : il embrasse trois villages, choisis en vertu de leur situation géographique, aux confins de la Limagne et de la Planèze de Saint-Flour, en retrait l'un de l'autre de façon que l'influence française descendant du Nord y présente une série de dégradés. Vertaizon est situé à quelques kilomètres de Vinzelles, naguère étudié par Dauzat ; Picherande, dans le sud du département du Puy-de-Dôme, est enfoncé dans le massif du Mont-Dore ; Bégut, plus écarté, se trouve dans le sud-est du Cantal, près de la limite administrative de la Lozère. En gros, ces trois localités jalonnent la haute vallée de l'Allier, par où s'opère la poussée linguistique unificatrice. Autre intérêt du site : il marque l'un des points septentrionaux de la zone occitane.

L'importance dialectologique de l'Auvergne (dont on peut, vu la maigreur des relevés qu'il y fit, se demander si Gilliéron en avait conscience) est aujourd'hui évidente. Avec l'Atlas Linguistique du Massif Central, dont le premier volume a paru en 1957, on aura un jour pour cette région un bon instrument de travail : jusqu'ici, les problèmes nombreux et complexes que posent les parlers auvergnats ont été abordés en ordre dispersés, à travers des monographies, (parfois, du reste, remarquables) depuis assez peu de temps. La thèse de Dauzat, de 1906, resta longtemps isolée ; son Glossaire de Vinzelles parut en revue, en 1913, 1914, puis 1925 ; et il faut attendre, en 1931, le travail de Lhermet sur Aurillac, en 1935 celui de Meinecke sur Lastic, pour voir naître un mouvement d'intérêt plus ample, qui ne s'affirme qu'après 1945.

L'Auvergne est certainement l'une des dernières régions de France

où l'on peut encore saisir sur le vif des faits de conflit linguistique complexe, faisant intervenir non seulement l'opposition français-patois, mais l'opposition patois-patois dans une zone "frontalière" où s'interpénètrent dans une mesure irrégulière les tendances françaises et occitanes; double opposition que l'existence, à côté et au milieu des patois, de "français locaux" (dans la structure instable desquels on retrouve les mêmes contradictions) rend plus difficiles encore à débrouiller. Le matériel réuni par Herzig présente, de ce point de vue, une utilité certaine, encore que l'on puisse regretter le parti-pris historique qui préside à sa présentation des faits . . . "auf Vulgärlateinischer Grundlage"! L'appareil philologique et le cadre d'exposition "datent" beaucoup, s'écartant à peine de ceux des manuels en usage dans les années 1910-1920. Le livre doit être pris pour ce qu'il est: une somme (comme telle, bienvenue) de faits non élaborés.

Amsterdam

P. ZUMTHOR

CH. CAMPROUX, *Etude syntaxique des parlers gévaudanais*, Presses Universitaires, Paris 1958; dans Publications de la faculté des lettres de l'université de Montpellier, 523 pages.

Cette importante thèse a pour objet quelques parties de la syntaxe occitane, saisie au niveau des patois actuels du Gévaudan. Elle exclut toute autre considération dialectologique au sens habituel de ce mot. L'étude part de la thèse déjà ancienne de Ronjat, *Essai de syntaxe des parlers provençaux modernes*, 1913 (thèse dont le texte, un peu modifié, fut incorporé en 1930 à la *Grammaire historique* du même auteur): ce que, au cours d'une enquête destinée principalement à recueillir des faits de phonétique et de morphologie, Ronjat avait noté de faits syntaxiques, tendait dans son esprit à prouver par l'exemple l'existence d'une syntaxe occitane originale, définissable par opposition au français . . . existence communément niée au début de ce siècle. Dans sa *Grammatica occitana*, Alibert signalait, parmi les terroirs occitans, le Carcin, le Rouergue, le Gévaudan et le pays de Foix comme les plus conservateurs en syntaxe, entendons les plus autonomes. C'est sur l'un de ces terroirs, qu'il connaît bien, que Camproux a fait porter son enquête.

Celle-ci, pratiquée en majeure partie sur le terrain (pour le reste, elle consista en dépouillements d'almanachs contemporains et d'oeuvres de quelques poètes locaux), ne l'a pas été sur la base d'un questionnaire: un première expérience ayant prouvé qu'une telle méthode, appliquée à des faits de syntaxe, multipliait exagérément les chances d'erreur de "traduction" de la part des témoins si l'on en faisait plus qu'un simple moyen de contrôle. Le matériel a été pour l'essentiel réuni par l'auteur au hasard de conservations, entendues ou provoquées, en divers lieux et circonstances, pendant deux ans pleins d'abord, puis durant des vacances périodiques au cours d'une dizaine d'années. Un nombre considérable de faits fut ainsi noté, sans préoccupation théorique (en quoi l'auteur déclare avoir suivi les conseils de L. Tesnières, *Comment construire une syntaxe*, Strasbourg 1934). Au reste, cette absence, hautement proclamée, d'idée préconçue, n'est point totale en ce sens que, se situant dans le sillage de Ronjat, l'auteur exclut par principe de sa collection les faits syntaxiques communs à ses parlers et au français. De la sorte, son ouvrage constitue un exposé et une analyse, moins de la syntaxe gévaudanaise que des écarts (des oppositions) constatées entre elle et la syntaxe française ou, pour mieux dire, la syntaxe galloromane commune.

Comme on le voit, un souci d'efficacité recoupe en cela une certaine méfiance envers toute systématisation. Ce double caractère se retrouve dans tout le livre. Lors de la collation du matériel, l'auteur a veillé à écarter, si j'ose dire, tout réflexe morphologique, et a tenté de laisser les faits eux-mêmes se classer naturellement; il aboutit ainsi à une première classification (dont la généralité, de quelque manière qu'on l'envisage et qu'on la juge, est typique de cet ouvrage et de sa méthode): 1. le verbe; 2. ce qui n'est pas le verbe. Dichotomie à la fois rentable et simpliste, que le plan du livre a fait éclater, exposant successivement: le verbe et ses catégories (temps, aspect, mode, voix: la plus grande partie de cet exposé est consacré au subjonctif, dont Camproux montre que les fonctions ne recouvrent pas celles qu'il remplit en français: v. spécialement les conclusions touchant ce mode, pp. 227-231); - l'accord; - les faits de dépendance (place des mots, cas, introductifs); - la négation; - la syntaxe expressive.

MANUEL ALVAR, *El español hablado en Tenerife*. Rev. de Fil. Esp., Anejo LXIX, Madrid, 1959, 248 pp. 4°.

Manuel Alvar (the well-known linguist who is organizing the Atlas Linguístico-etnográfico de Andalucía and was the author of the already familiar description of the Aragonese dialect) won the "Antonio de Nebrija" prize of 1955 with a study on an extra-peninsular dialect about which little was known before. It is the first serious study on a Canarian dialect. And how important they are! Alvar himself says in a foreword: "On the islands is the link which connects the peninsula with America. The influence of the Canaries on the colonization of certain sections of the New World is becoming more and more evident. The southern character of its dialect is a good touchstone to complete the picture which we have of the speech of southern Spain and of Spanish America. The colonization of the Canaries – not very much previous to that of the Indies – can explain linguistic facts heretofore unexplained".

In 1954 Alvar conducted research in three places on the island and the result was the complete description of the phonetics, morphology, and syntax. The lexicon turns out to be quite interesting; in it there can be distinguished pre-Hispanic elements, elements from the west of the peninsula (Lusitanisms), Andalusianisms, and other meridionalisms, Americanisms, and archaisms. The investigator concludes that the speech of the Canaries is not a dialect in the usual sense since none of its phonetic characteristics is peculiarly its own. Neither is its vocabulary so different from the other Hispanic ones as to justify independence. Though it has a peripheral character, it is not true, as has been claimed, that it has stagnated without evolving. It is incorrect to compare it with Judaeo Spanish; it is not a juxtaposed language but a superimposed one and as such a conquering one; the relations with the peninsula are normal and regular. In the vocabulary the nautical terms are remarkably numerous. The relation with the Republics of the Caribbean Sea is well known with respect to phonetics as well as to vocabulary. In another part its relation with zones of western Andalusia where the "seseo" occurs is brought out.

Several phonetic texts, a vocabular, an extensive bibliography, and quite a number of maps, sketches of utensils and photographs augment the usefulness and the attractiveness of this most praiseworthy study.

Santpoort

J. A. VAN PRAAG

ALONSO ZAMORA VICENTE, *Dialectología española*. Bibl. Rom. Hisp., Madrid, Gredos, 1960, 394 pp., 8°.

Before departing for Mexico to assume the honorable task of filling the void left by the master Alfonso Reyes at the University of Mexico, Zamora Vicente published a work which for many years to come will be a reliable guide in the wide terrain of Spanish dialectology, which is being explored more and more. The extensive bibliography at the end of the book, which has been utilized entirely, vouches for the modernity, the richness and the reliability of this new handbook.

Touching incidentally on Portuguese and Catalan, the author investigates the dialects of the whole Spanish territory. Of course he withholds himself from a prolonged discussion of Castilian, it being the official language, and examines only the Aragonese and Leonese dialects, which are in retreat, and Andalusian in its different forms.

Zamora Vicente takes Mozarabic as point of departure, then goes into the distribution throughout the peninsula of two general phonetic phenomena, aspiration of the "h" and "yeísmo". There follow chapters on the main dialects already mentioned and another on those he calls "transition languages", which are Extremeño, Riojano, Murcian and Canarian. He continues with excellent studies on Judaeo Spanish and the Spanish of America. He even includes Papiamento, for whose explanation he cites Van Wijk's research.

The renowned Biblioteca Románica Hispánica now has at its disposal a handbook on dialectology which, with all due respect to the familiar one by Vicente García de Diego, is in more ways than one superior to the older one.

Santpoort

J. A. VAN PRAAG

O. DUCHAČEK, *Latin bellus, vieux français bel* (tiré-à-part de *Studia neophilologica*, XXX, 2, 1958). *Joliment-bellement* (tiré-à-part de *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty Brněnské university* 1959, Rada jazykovedna A7). *La beauté, le beau – la joliesse, le joli* (tiré-à-part de *Philologica pragensia II* 1959).

Ces trois articles, dont j'ignore l'ordre de composition, constituent

les prolégomènes à une étude plus théorique, et d'intérêt plus général, parue dans la revue suisse *Vox romanica* en 1959 sous le titre de *Champ conceptuel de la beauté en français moderne*. L'auteur, prenant la suite de cette école de sémanticiens que l'on peut rattacher à J. Trier et à H. Sperber (et actuellement représentée en France, de façon assez différente, par G. Matoré d'une part, P. Guiraud de l'autre), revient sur les notions successivement élaborées de champ sémantique, de sphères de pensée, et autres semblables. Il tente de systématiser les distinctions et les ensembles qu'elles représentent, en un schéma dont l'équilibre est assuré par une opposition nouvelle, propre (en cette fonction) à l'auteur: entre "champ sémantique" et "champ conceptuel". Le second constitue une unité "formée par le concept commun aux contenus sémantiques de tous les mots qui le constituent; – le premier, plus complexe, plus vaste, réunit, "en les classant, des mots apparentés au point de vue du sens". La suite de l'article de *Vox romanica* justifiait cette distinction (fondée en extension plus qu'en nature) en analysant la "champ conceptuel" de la beauté. Les trois articles dont il est question ici contribuaient à préparer cette analyse en rassemblant critiquement une partie de sa matière: monographie de lt. *bellus*, afr. *bel*; opposition sémantique en fonctionnelle des adverbes *joliment-bellement*; relation et limites du couple abstrait *le beau-le joli*. Le premier de ces articles, le plus substantiel, conduit à des conclusions dont la généralité dépasse le seule histoire de français et touche à quelque typologie fondamentale: le concept de "beau" évolue tardivement, et se coule dans un matériel lexical déjà affecté d'autres charges sémantiques plus anciennes; – il existe (ou subsiste?) un courant double d'échanges entre les expressions de la beauté et de la bonté, de la facilité, de la sympathie, et même des expressions comme celle du bariolage; – la distinction des nuances de la beauté devient plus subtile dans la mesure où se subtilise l'intellect et où se perfectionnent les catégories lexicales dont il dispose.

Amsterdam

P. ZUMTHOR

HENRY MENDELOFF, *The Evolution of the Conditional Sentence Contrary to Fact in Old Spanish*. The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C., 1960, 106 pp., gr. 8°.

Until recently there has been little detailed research on the nature and evolution of conditional sentences in Spanish. E. Gessner's study in the Z.F.r.Ph.XIV (1890) is still valuable as a starting point, and Leavitt O. Wright contributed important data in his thesis "The -ra Verb Form in Spain" (Berkeley, 1932). Neither grammars of modern Spanish nor historical grammars are detailed enough in this respect to enable us to consider the complicated question of the use of the tenses ending in -ía, -se, -ra and -re as being completely solved.

Henry Mendeloff limits himself to an exhaustive study of the medieval usage. Drawing upon important literary texts for examples he has reached interesting conclusions. In the first place he finds a marked difference between the use of the tenses in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and that in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Whereas the frequency of the phrase "Si tuviese daría" was about alike in both periods (this was the usual way of reproducing the Latin phrase "Si haberem darem"), there was, on the contrary, a noticeable discrepancy between the two periods in the constructions which correspond to the Latin "Si habuissem dedissem". In the 12th and 13th centuries the form by far most frequent was "Si tuviese daría"; in the 14th and 15th, "Si tuviera diera". This cannot fail to surprise us, in view of modern usage.

The author draws another conclusion from his extensive study: the evolution of the conditional phrase in Castilian manifests a process of selection and refining.

Santpoort

J. A. VAN PRAAG

Bolletino dell'Atlante linguistico mediterraneo, I, Venise et Rome, 1959.

L'idée d'un Atlas linguistique méditerranéen fut lancée dès 1937 par M. Deanovic, au congrès des études romanes de Nice: elle devait être discutée au congrès de Bruxelles de 1939; la guerre stoppa les projets. L'affaire ne fut reprise qu'au congrès de Florence en 1956 (v. les *Actes* de ce congrès, publiés chez Sansoni, Florence, en 1960, II, pp. 793-797). C'est alors que fut choisi un comité et constitué un secrétariat. Dès lors, des spécialistes de tous les pays méditerranéens sont descendus sur

le terrain. L'objet de l'Atlas est de recueillir, dans 125 localités choisies à intervalles à peu près égaux sur toutes les côtes de la Méditerranée et de la mer Noire, les termes désignant les activités propres à ces mers: navigation (avec la météorologie), pêche, cultures côtières, métiers et commerce. "Douer cette mer, écrit A. Steiger (*Bolletino*, p. 139), de vie linguistique, c'est vouloir retrouver les caractères essentiels et distinctifs de la vie même, la naissance, la croissance, l'assimilation, la mort, ce qui enfin constitue un organisme vivant; c'est retracer l'histoire linguistique de toute la civilisation méditerranéenne".

La création du *Bolletino* répond au besoin de maintenir un lien entre des enquêteurs dispersés dans une vingtaine de pays différents, et travaillant dans des domaines linguistiques non identiques. Ce numéro I contient, outre certains résultats partiels déjà classés (L. Michel, *Noms de l'alose dans le golfe du Lion et migration d'un nom atlantique en Méditerranée*; – O. Parlangèli, *La coltivazione dei metili nel lago di Ganzirri (Messina): saggio di terminologia*), quelques articles méthodologiques (à signaler spécialement A. Martinet, *Affinité linguistique*), et des indications générales destinées aux futurs usagers de l'Atlas: liste et références des points d'enquête (avec carte); système de transcription phonétique, et texte du questionnaire. Ce dernier comporte 810 termes (donnés ici en italien et en français), et une série de 35 questions destinées à provoquer des réactions complémentaires: type de questionnaire dont, en d'autres occasions, il y aurait beaucoup à dire, mais auquel ont été tenus les auteurs, par suite de l'étendue des secteurs à explorer et de la nature très hétérogène du milieu.

Amsterdam

P. ZUMTHOR

LINGUA is issued quarterly, one volume containing about 450 pages.

Subscription price a volume florins 30,— (\$ 8.—, 60sh).

Backnumbers are partly available; send your request to the publishers.

Subscriptions should be sent to your bookseller or directly to the publishers: *North-Holland Publishing Company, P.O.B. 103, Amsterdam-C, Holland.*

Manuscripts should be original typescripts (not carbon copies), in double spacing and on one side of the paper only; written in the English, French or German language and carefully revised as alterations in print are expensive. They must be accompanied by a summary of 5 to 10 lines. This summary will be printed at the head of the article. Authors alone are responsible for the opinions expressed in their papers.

Manuscripts and publications for review or listing should be sent exclusively to *A. Reichling, Amsteldijk 86'''*, Amsterdam-Z., Holland. Reviews are printed as circumstances permit. No publication sent in can be returned.

Reprints. Contributors will be entitled to receive 50 free reprints. Extra reprints will be available at cost.

Please indicate number of additional reprints on the proof.

LINGUA est publié en quatre fascicules par an, un volume complet comprenant 450 pages environ.

Prix de l'abonnement: Hfl. 30,— (\$ 8.—, 60sh) par an.

Les abonnements doivent être commandés au libraire ou à l'éditeur. Pour tous les renseignements concernant les abonnements et l'administration, prière de s'adresser à l'éditeur: *North-Holland Publishing Company, P.O.B. 103, Amsterdam-C, Pays-Bas.*

Les manuscrits doivent être écrits à la machine, double espace; l'envers de la page doit être blanc. Les auteurs sont priés de soumettre leurs manuscrits en anglais, français ou allemand, et d'apporter tous leurs soins pour éviter des frais supplémentaires de la correction dans les épreuves.

Un résumé de 5 à 10 lignes doit accompagner les manuscrits. Ce résumé sera publié en tête de l'article.

Les auteurs sont seuls responsables pour le contenu de leurs articles.

Les manuscrits et les publications pour compte rendu ou notice doivent être adressés exclusivement à *M. A. Reichling, Amsteldijk 86'''*, Amsterdam-Z., Pays-Bas. Les comptes rendus seront publiés autant qu'il sera possible. Aucune publication ne pourra être rendue.

Tirages à part. Les auteurs ont droit de recevoir 50 tirages à part gratuits. Des tirés à part supplémentaires sont disponibles au prix coûtant. Prière d'indiquer le nombre sur l'épreuve.

ED IN STACKS
Mar 1657

STYLISTIC REPETITION IN THE VEDA

by

J. GONDA

It is, in the present publication, the author's intention to deal with a group of syntactic and stylistic problems which are, generally speaking, characterized by repetition: repetition of words and word groups, anaphora, alliteration, rhyme, parallelisms, paronomasia, responsio, assonance, balanced structures, complementary word groups, enumerations, amplification, conduplication, etc. etc. The author has illustrated his argument with thousands of examples borrowed from Sanskrit and hundreds taken from Greek and other languages many of which are translated.

7 x 10" 413 pages f 48.— (96 s., \$ 13.50)

Ask your Bookseller or the Publishers

**NORTH-HOLLAND PUBLISHING COMPANY
AMSTERDAM**

DER EINFLUSS VERGILS AUF DIE CARMINA LATINA EPIGRAPHICA

EINE STUDIE MIT BESONDERER
BERÜCKSICHTIGUNG DER METRISCH-
TECHNISCHEN GRUNDSÄTZE DER ENTLEHNUNG

von

R. P. HOOGMA

In this work the author has tried to bring together as completely as possible the borrowings from Vergil's Aeneid in the *carmina latina epigraphica* and to present us with a survey of the actual situation concerning these epigraphica (sepulchral, mural, dedicatory, and commemorative verse-inscriptions).

6½ x 9½" xxiv + 373 pages f 30.— (60 s., \$ 8.40)

Ask your Bookseller or the Publishers

**NORTH-HOLLAND PUBLISHING COMPANY
AMSTERDAM**